THE NEW SCHEME OF DOCTRINE

Contained in the

ANSWERS

John OF *Fleming*

Mr. *JOHN SIMSON*, Professor of Divinity in the Colledge of *Glasgow*; to Mr. *WEBSTER*'s Libel, considered and examined,

By Mr. *JOHN M'CLAREN*, one of the Minister's of *Edinburgh*.

EDINBURGH, Printed by *JOHN REID*.
Anno 1717.

DOCTRINE
OF
NEW SCHEME
THE

TO

The Right Honourable,

JOHN CAMPBEL *Esquire Lord Provost,*

CHARLES HOPE,
JAMES CLELAND,
GEORGE HALYBURTON,
ARCHIBALD M'ALLA, } *Baillies;*

JOHN WIGHTMAN *Dean of Gild,*

ROBERT WIGHTMAN *Treasurer,*

WILLIAM WIGHTMAN *Deacon Convener,*

And the Remanent Members of the Honourable Council of EDINBURGH,

Right Honourable,

MAgistrates are by their Office, Keepers of both TABLES of the LAW, which warrants my Prefixing of Your Names to this Performance, such as it is. And indeed I could think on none, to whom this so justly belongs, as to Your Honours; partly from that just Regard I owe to You, and partly having the Honour to be a Minister in the City, wherein You stand in such a Publick and Honourable Capacity. Besides

that this Eſſay being brought forth, within Your Juriſdiction, as it were, claims Your Protection.

HOWEVER, this Performance, may be, is not ſo accurate, as to pleaſe the Palates of ſome; yet I hope, therein is aſſerted Nothing, but our Good Old Doctrine, in Oppoſition to dangerous Errors, which in their Nature tend, to worm out the Vitals of the Goſpel.

OF this Goſpel Doctrine, You have been ſtill the Favourers and Defenders; eſpecially in the late Unnatural Rebellion, when all our Religious and Civil Concerns lay at the Stake; at which Time, ſeveral of You were in the Magiſtracy, and all of You generally on the Government of the City, and did then ſhew a reſolute and undaunted Zeal, amidſt the greateſt Dangers, for the Proteſtant Religion, the Proteſtant Succeſſion in the Illuſtrious Family of *HANOVER*, and for our preſent Gracious Sovereign King *GEORGE*, whom the LORD long preſerve.

PARTICULARLY, My Lord, Your conſtant Vigilancy, and unwearied Fatigue for the Preſervation of this City, when the Enemy was at our Gates, and this City like a Ripe Grape ready to drop into their Mouths, is not to be forgotten. How great Things the Lord did then for us is manifeſt. And being ſo well known to Your Honours, a Rehearſal of them here is needleſs, tho' alas! like *Iſrael* we *ſoon forget his mighty Works*.

WHEN GOD hath been graciouſly pleaſed thus to ſcatter, and diſſipate theſe black Clouds, and to bleſs us with a prolonging of our Tranquility, and the Enjoyment of our Liberties Religions

ligious and Civil, under the Government of ſo good a King: May the Continuance of Truth, a Spirit of Goſpel Holineſs, of Chriſtian Love and Unity, and a Thankful Improvement of our many and Valuable Privileges, be our Mercy.

THAT the LORD may guide You, in all Your Publick Adminiſtrations, and in Your Noble Deſigns to advance the Intereſts of this City, under its heavy Burthens; ſo as you may have the Honour and Satisfaction, to ſee the prudent Meaſures Ye have taken, for the Support of this City, crowned with deſirable Succeſs, in the flouriſhing of Religion in this Place, and a Revival of all its Civil Concerns and Intereſts, and thereby entail a Bleſſing to Your ſelves and Families, and a ſavoury Remembrance of Your Names to following Generations, is the ſincere Prayer of,

Right Honourable,

Your moſt Humble and Obedient Servant in the LORD,

June 26. 1717.

John M'claren.


BRITISH MUSEUM
15
60
APR

CANDID READER,

TRuth is a Precious and Valuable Truſt, or Depoſitum, *in the keeping of which pure, all in their ſeveral Stations are deeply concerned; Truth being the Mean and Foundation of Faith, and as it were, the Mother of true Holineſs*, Phil. 1. 27. Jude: 3. *But more eſpecially Miniſters of the Goſpel, are concerned in preſerving the Streams of Goſpel Truths pure; for they are Stewards of the Myſteries of GOD*, 1 Cor. 4. 1. *and to them is this glorious Goſpel committed*, 1 Tim: 1. 11. *They are like Standard-Bearers ſet in the firſt Rank, for the Defence of the Goſpel*, Phil: 1. 17. *and are therefore to commit the ſame Truths to Faithful Men, as their Succeſſors, who ſhall be able alſo to teach others*, 2 Tim. 2. 2.

It hath been the great Mercy of the Church of Scotland, *ever ſince the* Reformation *to enjoy Purity of Goſpel Doctrines, in ſuch a Degree that no Reformed Church equalled, at leaſt excelled her in this; To ſpeak nothing of her Worſhip, Government and Diſcipline. How lamentable will it be, if this Ruine be under our Hand, and we ſuffer theſe pure Streams of Goſpel Doctrines, which our Fathers have handed down to us, with ſo much wreſtling, to be imbittered with the Wormwood of Error. This will be Unfaithfulneſs to our Fathers, from whom theſe precious Truths were conveyed down to us; to their and our Poſterity, whoſe Souls muſt needs be ruined by the turning of the Waters of the Sanctuary into Blood*, Pſal: 78. 3, 4, 5, 6. *And above all, it will be Unfaithfulneſs to the Glorious Redeemer, the true and Faithful Witneſs, by whom the Preſerving and Tranſmitting*

down

down of Gospel Truths to after Generations is committed to Ministers, 2 Cor: 4. 7. 1. Tim: 6. 20. *And must needs expose to a Melancholy Reckoning on Day, where there is either a departing from the Truth, or the want of a due Zeal for preserving Truth, and censuring Error; We see how sharply the Angels of the Churches of* Pergamus *and* Thyatira *are reproved by our Lord, for their Lukewarmness this Way,* Rev. 2.

The Subject under Consideration here, is, Professor Simson's *new Scheme, contained in his Answers to Mr.* Webster's *Libel. I freely own, That the Professor is a Man of Learning and Parts, above any thing I can pretend to (for they commonly say,* Virtus in hoste laudanda est*) as also that he seems to be of an agreeable Conversation. But I am sorry he should have employed his Parts, to teach and defend such dangerous Errors, as tend to worm out the Vitals of our received Doctrine, and as it were to bring in another Gospel. It brings to my Mind what I have read of an Honest and plain Christian, who, when at some of the old Councils, a Man of Acuteness and Parts was defending Error, said to him,* Diabolus te cupit ornari, *i. e.* Satan *covets to dress or set off himself, or his ill Cause with your Learning.*

As for my self, I can declare with great Candor, That a Concern for the Purity of our Doctrine was the great Motive that influenced me to this Performance (however otherwise unfit for it; beside the many Interruptions in my Ministerial Work, that inevitably did cast up) I could have been glad that others, (whose Station in this Church obliges them, like the He-goats *to appear in the first Rank for our Doctrine: As also render them more capable for a*

Work

Work of this Nature) had taken this Scheme to Task, it ſhould have ſaved me of my Labour: However, I would gladly pleaſe my ſelf with the Thoughts, that ſome of them will take this new Doctrine under Conſideration, by whom a Performance of this Kind, will be done with more Accuracy and Cloſeneſs, than is any Thing here advanced by me; As alſo, it will be more regarded, and have much more Weight with many.

I ſhall ſay nothing as to what the late Venerable Aſſembly hath done this Way, I heartily wiſh, and pray, that the Teſtimony, the Aſſembly hath given againſt ſuch new Schemes, and new Doctrines may by the Bleſſing of a gracious GOD be made an effectual Mean to diſcourage Error, and to curb its ſpreading for the future; tho' I fear (I ſhall be glad to be diſappointed in my Fears) that the Leaven hid in the Barrel of Meal is already fermenting, and that the Tears ſown, while Men have been ſleeping, will not be found eaſy to grub up.

I am ſenſible, that this Performance may labour under ſome Imperfections and Defects; Perhaps the Stile is not ſo Polite, as to pleaſe the Palates of ſome; but I hope it is plain and intelligible: May be there will be found Repetitions here and there, but beſides, that the Method I followed in ſetting down the Profeſſor's own Words in a great Part, gave occaſion thereto, they are but ſhort, and may be neceſſary to them of Vulgar Capacities, whoſe Souls are deeply concerned in the Purity of Goſpel Doctrine.

How cloſe this Performance may be, I leave to the Judgment of diſcerning and impartial Readers, who are Lovers of the Purity of Goſpel Doctrines. Perhaps there may be ſome Things in his Anſwers that I have not taken Notice of; but I can freely

ly declare that I have not knowingly, paſſed any Thing, that I apprehend was material. There is a Diſtinction was uſed by the Profeſſor, at the laſt Aſſembly upon the Head of moral Serioufneſs, which I thought needleſs to inſert in that Chapter; becauſe it is there on the Matter anſwered, but becauſe ſome may deſire a particular Anſwer to it, I ſhall here ſet it down. The Diſtinction is, That natural Men have an Ability of natural Powers to uſe Means with moral Serioufneſs, but not an Ability of Will to apply theſe Powers. *Now upon this, we offer theſe Conſiderations,* 1ſt. *The* Arminian *Objection dreſſed up, and adopted by himſelf returns in full Force: For, may not an* Arminian *ſay, How conſiſts it with GOD's Goodneſs to promiſe Converſion to natural Men, upon their uſing the Means with moral Serioufneſs, when yet it is no Way in the Power of their Wills ſo to do; eſpecially ſince the Will is the chief Power and Spring of Action?* 2dly. *Is not the Will it ſelf a natural Power? It ſeems then that the other natural Powers are not ſo much diſabled, and corrupted by Sin, as the Will is, which ſeems ſtrange, and contrary to Scripture; which deſcribes natural Men not only as Enemies and Rebels, but as Darkneſs, as weak and utterly impotent; yea as dead.* Rom: 8. 7, 8. Eph: 2. 1. 1 Cor: 2. 14. 3dly. *I would know, what theſe natural Powers are, of which ſuch have the Ability? They muſt certainly be the Affections, as Love, Hatred, Hope, Fear, Sorrow,* &c. *But beſides, that theſe are but different Branches and Modifications of the Will; Is it not harſh to ſay, That Men have a Power to love GOD, to hate and grieve for Sin with* Moral Serioufneſs, *and yet want Ability of Will to do ſo? It ſeems Mens Affections are not ſo corrupt as their Will is, which one would think*

a little ſtrange. 4thly. *It is true natural Men have an Ability to do ſeveral things, they will not do; but it's as certain, that what internal Acts they have a Power to do, they have an equal Ability of Will for them: For the elicite Acts of Love, Hatred,* &c. *are indeed Acts of the Will, and but different Ways of the Wills going out towards its proper Object.* 5thly. *Doth he not in the* 220 Pag: *of his Anſwers, expreſly ſay,* That they who neglect to uſe the Means with moral Seriouſneſs, have no better Excuſe, than they would have for ſlighting the neceſſary Means of their Health. *Now, if this be true, then Men muſt have an equal Ability of Will to uſe the Means of Grace with moral Seriouſneſs, that they have to uſe the ordinary Means of their Health? Otherwiſe they have a better Excuſe for not uſing the Means with moral ſeriouſneſs, than they have for the ſlighting of the Means of their Health: For according to this Diſtinction, Men want Ability of Will to uſe the Means with moral Seriouſneſs; whereas every one will own that Men have a ſufficient Ability of Will to uſe the Means of their bodily Health.*

To Conclude, if this Eſſay (ſuch as it is) may be any way Subſervient to the Vindicating of Truth and Eſtabliſhing ſome therein, when Error ſeems to be the Judgment, wherewith GOD is threatning this declining Generation, I have the great Thing I deſign therein. That a Gracious GOD for the ſake of the Lord Chriſt, may preſerve Purity of Doctrine and Goſpel Ordinances with us, while Sun and Moon endure; Bleſs them with a Day of his Power, revive a Covenanted Work of Religion, Zeal for it, a Spirit of Love and Unity among Miniſters and Profeſſors, is the hearty and ſincere Prayer of,

Thy Servant in the Work of the LORD,

JOHN M'CLAREN.

Candid Reader,

THere being but few Literal Eſcapes, that mai the Senſe, 'tis hop'd, you will correct theſe following, and the like, *viz.*

PAg: 19. *Lin*: 13. *for* is more, *Read* is no more. *Pag* 48. *Lin*: 17. *dele* for this. *P:* 49 *L:* 1. *for* eleget, *read* elegit. *P*: 57. *L.* 3. *for* Ends *R:* End. *P:* 62. *L.* 23. *for* veſtram *R*: veſtrum. *P*: 69. *L*: 19. *dele* the. *P*: 73. *L*: 5. *for* treatning, *R*: treating. *P:* 94. *L*: 12. *for* Proſitions, *R:* Propoſitions. *P:* 96. *L:* *ult*: *for* it, *R*: is. *P:* 107. *L*: 2. *for* Premiſſion, *R:* Permiſſion. *P:* 134. *L*: 24. *for* ipſum, *R:* ipſam. *P:* 159. *L:* 21. *for* thought, *R*: tho'. *P*: 174. *L:* 13. *for* threatneth, *R*: threatned. *P*: 194. *L*: 15. *R*: to. *P*: 195. *L*: 1. *for* Verue, *R*: Vertue. *P*: 199. *L*: 21. *for* if as, *R:* as if. *P:* 212. *L:* 27. *for* to, *R:* or *P*: 239. *L:* 9. *for* Believers, *R:* believe. *P:* 253. *L:* 13. *for* on, *R.* no. *P:* 343. *L:* 14: *R*: is. *L*: 28. *for* I 1, *R*: I T. *P.* 350. *L*: 10. *for* or, *R:* of. *P:* 356. *L*: 11. *for* never, *R:* ever. *P*: 379. *L*: 10: *dele* with.

CHAPTER I.

Concerning Objective Revelation, *by the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence,* &c.

BEING (the LORD assisting) to consider Mr. *Simson*'s Answers to Mr. *Webster*'s Libel; we shall chiefly take Notice of such Positions, as are expressly own'd by *him in his Defences*, and endeavour to make such Remarks upon them, as we hope, shall make it plain to every judicious and unbyassed Reader, That the Pro-

poſitions, own'd by him, are neither minute Errors, nor only different Ways of ſpeaking, as ſome would make them; whoſe Soundneſs in the Faith, or at leaſt their Zeal for it, becomes to me upon that very Account, to be queſtionable.

HIS Anſwer to the firſt Article of the Libel, and additional Libel, *pag:*75. *viz.* That Mr. *Webſter* alledges, *That the firſt Error, contains ſeveral Propoſitions, which cannot be proven by Scripture, or by neceſſary Conſequence there from; and are therefore contrary to the* Confeſſion of Faith, *Chap:* 1. *Par:* 1. *and* Cat: Larg: Queſt. 2. Is as follows.

1. THAT *theſe Propoſitions, as taught by him, can be proven from Scripture.* 2dly. *That tho' they could not; yet they would not therefore be contrary to theſe Paſſages of the Confeſſion and Catechiſm, cited by Mr.* Webſter; *which ſay, That the Scriptures are the Rule of Faith and Life: Becauſe the Words, as explained §. 6. are to be underſtood of all Things neceſſary to GOD's Glory, Man's Salvation, Faith and Life; which are to be proved by expreſs Scripture, or Conſequence therefrom.* And therefore, he ſays, *That ſince he doth not teach, that theſe Propoſitions are a neceſſary Part of the Rule of our Faith; altho' they could not be proved by Scripture, he does not contradict what is there ſaid in the* Confeſſion of Faith, *and* Catechiſms.

BUT 1*ſt.* Whether theſe Propoſitions as taught by him can be proven from Scripture, any indifferent Perſon may judge. He had done well to have adduced ſome Scriptures, from which theſe Propoſitions might be proven. 2*dly.* Theſe Propoſitions are in Scripture, either expreſly or by Conſequence: If they are not, then are they certainly

tainly erroneous, and ſhould not be taught; if they are contained in Scripture, either expreſly or by Conſequence, then are they a Part of the Rule of Faith: For the whole Scriptures are the Rule of Faith: So that while he ſeems to reſtrain the Scriptures being a Rule to things neceſſary to GOD's Glory and Mans Salvation, I do not ſo well take up. For, 3*ly*. Either the Scriptutes are a Rule of Faith and Life, in all things they reveal, or only in things abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation. If the *Firſt*, why makes he a Reſtriction, *viz.* of all things neceſſary to GOD's Glory and Man's Salvation: For he would ſeem to inſinuate, *That the Scripture is not a Rule in all things it reveals*; If the *Second*, then it is pretty Groſs; for ſo Men are at Liberty to Believe as they pleaſe; If it be not in things abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation, *i. e.* in Fundamentals; And ſo the Scriptures bind only as a Rule in things Fundamental.

4. I would know, if there be any part of the Scripture, that is not a neceſſary Part of the Rule of Faith? If there be not, why doth he juſtify himſelf from this, That he calls not theſe Propoſitions a neceſſary Part of the Rule of Faith. If there be any Part of the Scripture, that is not a neceſſary Part of the Rule of Faith, does not this reflect upon the Wiſdom of GOD, in giving us any Part of the Rule of Faith, that is not neceſſary. If he ſay, That by a neceſſary Part of the Rule, he means a Part abſolutely neceſſary, and not a Part that is only neceſſary, *ad melius et clarius eſſe*. Then we reply; 1*ſt*. Why did not he diſtinguiſh ſo? 2*dly*. His Words allow not that Diſtinction, as is obvious: For he ſays, *That the Meaning of* Par-

6th. Chap. 1. of the Confeſſion of Faith, *is, That the Scriptures are a Rule, in all things neceſſary to GOD's Glory, and Man's Salvation.* Now if he underſtand this of things, not only ſimply neceſſary; but alſo of things neceſſary, *ad melius et clarius eſſe*; then there is no Room for this Reſtriction, becauſe there are no other things, of which the *Scriptures* are a Rule; and if he mean of things abſolutely neceſſary to Salvation; then the former Difficulty recurs.

2. He ſays, *That ſince he teaches not that theſe Propoſitions are a neceſſary Part of the Rule of Faith; tho' they could not be proven from Scripture, he does not contradict what is there ſaid, in the* Confeſſion of Faith *and* Catechiſms. But this we cannot well underſtand. For, 1*ſt*. Is there any Part of the Rule of Faith, that is not a neceſſary Part? For he calls theſe Propoſitions, *A Part of the Rule*, tho' not *a neceſſary Part*. 2*dly*. Can any thing be a Part of the Rule of Faith, in any Senſe, that cannot be proven from Scripture? For this he plainly inſinuates. 3*dly*. For any thing to be a Part of the Rule of Faith, which cannot be proven from Scripture, is contrary to both *Scripture, Confeſſion of Faith and Catechiſms*: For doth not the ſecond Queſtion of the *Catechiſms*, call the *Scriptures, the only Rule*; and *Par*: 6. *Chap*: 1. *Confeſſ*. ſays, *That unto this Rule, nothing is at any Time to be added, whether by new Revelations of the Spirit, or Traditions of Men.* Now if theſe Propoſitions of his, be a Part of the Rule, tho' not a neceſſary Part, and that even upon Suppoſition they could not be proven from Scripture: If this be not to deny the Scripture to be the only Rule; yea and an Addition to that Rule, any indifferent Perſon

may

may judge. And any may ſee, what a wide Door this opens to Innovations in Doctrine, and Worſhip; providing it be not maintained, that they are a neceſſary Part of that Rule.

THE *Firſt* Propoſition Mr. *Webſter* charges him with, is, *That the End of GOD's Revelation towards the Heathens, is not only their Conviction and greater Reſtraint; but alſo that they may ſeek after further Diſcoveries of the LORD to themſelves,* viz. *of his being reconcilable, and of the Way how:* Which Mr. *Webſter* alledges to be contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap.* 1. *Par.* 1.

TO this Mr. *Simſon* anſwers; 1*ſt. That altho' the Ends mentioned by him, were not comprehended in what the* Confeſſion of Faith *ſays there, yet they would not on that Account, be contrary thereto; becauſe there are Hundreds of Mathematical Propoſitions, which are not comprehended in what is ſaid in Scripture, or Confeſſion of Faith.* And further he affirms, *That the Two Ends of the Revelation made to Heathens, mentioned by* Markius, *and named in the Libel, are as little inſinuated in theſe Words of the* Confeſſion of Faith, *as his Ends are.* 2*dly.* He anſwers, *That ſuppoſing there be any dark Hint given by the Light of Nature, the Works of Creation and Providence, comprehending Tradition,* viz. *That GOD is reconcilable to Sinners; this will further manifeſt GOD's Goodneſs, Wiſdom, and Power, and leave Men more inexcuſeable, than if no ſuch Hints were given; and alſo will oblige Men, to ſeek after a fuller Diſcovery of theſe.* And from this alledges, That this ſhould *be comprehended under the End mentioned in the* Confeſſion of Faith; And as a Confirmation that he is not *ſingular* in this, he alledges, *Turret. Parte prima, Quæſt:* 4*ta. Par:* 4. And *Pictetus Lib:*

I.

1. *Cap*: 2. *Par*: 4. Where one of the Ends of the Revelation given to Heathens, is ſaid, *Ut Incitamentum ſit ad quærendam illuſtriorem Revelationem.* 3*dly*. He ſays, *That ſince the Libel owns, That he teaches, That the Heathen cannot know the particular Way of Salvation: It follows plainly from his Doctrine, That the Heathen have no ſufficient Knowledge of GOD and of his Will, which is neceſſary to Salvation.*

BUT 1*ſt*. Are we to allow any Ends of this Revelation to Heathens, which are not comprehended in the Scriptures; ſo he plainly aſſerts, from his Reaſons drawn from *Mathematical Propoſitions*: This ſeems to be a dangerous Poſition. 2*dly*. His Reaſons from *Mathematical Propoſitions* is weak; becauſe the Libel ſpeaks of Propoſitions of Divinity, which muſt be proven either from expreſs Scripture, or by good Conſequence therefrom. 3*dly*. The Two Ends mentioned by *Markius*, are of a Piece with the End mentioned in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, and belong to the natural, not ſupernatural Order of Things, as doth the Revelation of GOD, as reconcilable; and the Ends mentioned by *Markius* do not tend to exalt the Strength of Mens natural Reaſon and free Will too far, as the Propoſition advanced by him doth: And further, *Markius* in that ſame *Paragraph* expreſly denies, That the End of natural *Theologie* is the Salvation of Heathens; but if the End of the Revelation made to Heathens be to hold forth GOD as reconcilable, and if it be in their Power to improve that objective Revelation as Mr. *Simſon* affirms; Then the End of that Revelation, made to Heathens, muſt be their Salvation. 4*thly*. The Reaſon advanced by him

him to prove that Heathens may know, that GOD is reconcilable, will alſo prove, that they may know the particular Way of Salvation; which yet he juſt now denyed: For this will much more diſcover GOD's Goodneſs to the Heathen, and leave them without Excuſe, upon Suppoſition they may know, not only that GOD is reconcilable, but alſo the particular Way of Salvation. 5*thly*. The Place alledged out of *Turrett. Loco* 1 *Quæſt*: 4*ta*. *Parag*: 4. proves not what he intends. For *Turrett*: ſpeaks only of further diſcoveries of GOD in general; not a Word of GOD as reconcilable: And it's plain, that it muſt be underſtood of Diſcoveries of GOD, *in eodem genere Revelationis*, as a Creator, Preſerver, and Benefactor in general, as is obvious from *Paragraph* 6, and 7. to any that reads that Queſtion. And the ſame Anſwer ſerve the Place cited by him out of *Pictet*. of the Four Ends mentioned by the ſaid Author; The Words cited by Mr. *Simſon*, viz. *Rurſus incitamentum eſt ad quærendam illuſtriorem Revelationem*, make the third End of that Revelation; Where it's plain he ſpeaks only of Revelation in general, and not a Word of a Revelation of GOD as reconcilable; Which is further plain from *Pictetus* Anſwer to the Queſtion in the ſame *Page*, *viz*. What Heathens may know by the Light of Nature; in anſwer to which Queſtion, he condeſcends on twelve Particulars they may know, all belonging to the Natural Order of Things; but not a word of GOD's being reconcilable, in all theſe twelve Particulars.

LASTLY let it be obſerved, That theſe two Authors cited by him, have not one Word of Tradition

tion, which yet Mr. *Simſon* ſtill takes in; So that theſe two Teſtimonies will prove more than Mr. *Simſon* aſſerts: *Viz.* That the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, without Tradition, reveal GOD as reconcilable.

BUT further, we offer theſe Conſiderations upon this Propoſition, *viz.* That there are dark hints given by the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, including Tradition, *OF GOD's BEING RECONCILABLE*, *1ſt.* This is plainly the ſame with univerſal Objective Grace; For what is univerſal Objective Grace elſe, than an univerſal Objective Revelation of GOD's being reconcilable, as is plain to any that reads *Turrett. Part: 2da. Quæſt. 6.* who mentions this as the *Arminians* Opinion, and alſo as the Opinion of ſome *French* Divines, who were *Univerſaliſts*: as *Teſtardus*, *Amyraldus*, and tells us they maintain a threefold Call, *1ſt.* Real, by the Works of Creation and Providence, which is the ſame with his Objective Revelation of GOD, as reconcilable, by the Works of Creation, *&c.* *2dly*: A verbal Call by the Word. *3dly.* An Internal Call by the Spirit.

2. THIS brings in other Means of knowing that GOD is reconcilable beſides the Word; but as no means reveal GOD to be reconciled, but the Word; ſo no Means reveal him to be reconcilable but the Word: For they both ſuppoſe the ſame Means, which ſeems contrar to *2 Cor.* 5. 18, 19. where the Goſpel is called, *The Word of Reconcilation*: But if the Works of Creation and Providence, *&c.* be an Objective Revelation of GOD's Reconcilableneſs, then this is not peculiar

liar to the Scripture to be the Word of Reconciliation. 3*dly*. He owns *Page* 79. of his *Defences*, *That GOD's being reconcilable to Sinners, presupposes, that he hath provided a Remedy from Eternity for sin.* Now if the Works of Creation and Providence, &c. be an Objective Revelation of GOD's Reconcilableness, they must also in the same way reveal, that a Remedy for sin is provided, which I would conceive a little harsh to affirm, that any Thing beside the Gospel should reveal a Remedy for sin is provided.

4. EITHER the Light of Nature, Works of Creation, and Providence, separatly from Tradition, or only in Conjunction with Tradition, reveal GOD to be reconcilable, this last we shall consider afterwards. The first cannot be; For they must either be Natural Means of revealing GOD reconcilable, or Means by new Institution. That they are not Natural Means, is clear: For they could not reveal GOD to be reconcilable to *Adam* before he had fallen, then he did not need Reconciliation. 2*dly*. They could not discover GOD to be reconcilable to *Adam*, in the Interval betwixt his fall, and the Revelation of the Gospel to *Adam*. And we may suppose that GOD might have delayed for some Years His revealing to *Adam* his Purpose of sending a Redeemer. Will any say, That *Adam* then could have known any Thing of GOD's being reconcilable? 3*dly*. If there be a new Institution appointing them Means of revealing GOD to be reconcilable, I want to know where that Institution is to be found.

4. NEVER any yet came to know GOD, to be re-

reconcilable, by the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence; For theſe are Means only *Ordinis Naturalis*; but reconcilableneſs belongs to a Supernatural Order of Things, and ſuppoſes a diſtinct, even a ſupernatural Revelation. Is it not a reflection upon GOD's Wiſdom, to appoint Means of knowing Him, as reconcilable, by which never any was brought to know Him as ſuch, as it would be, if none were enlightned or converted by the Ordinance of the Goſpel.

6. THIS is the Neſt-Egg, and as it were *Baſis* of *Arminian* Doctrine upon this Subject; For the three following Propoſitions, he owns are bottom'd upon this Propoſition. And I conceive they look very like *Arminian* Doctrine.

7. THIS Propoſition is contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap.* 1. *Par.* 1. where it's ſaid, That *the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence* are inſufficient to give the Knowledge of GOD that is neceſſary to Salvation, and in that ſame *Parag.* mentions the Means whereby GOD gave that Knowledge to his Church. As *1ſt.* The various ways of GOD's revealing Himſelf to the Old Teſtament Fathers, before his Will was committed to Writing. *2dly.* The written Word contained in the Scripture of the Old and New Teſtament, from which Words it's plain, *1ſt.* That the Means that give the Knowledge neceſſary to Salvation, are only allowed to the Church. *2dly.* That the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, *&c.* are not Means for attaining that Knowledge; for that *Parag.* in the *Confeſſion* having ſaid, *That they are not ſufficient, to give that Knowledge of GOD, and of His Will, which is neceſſary unto*

unto Salvation, immediately ſubjoins, *Therefore it pleaſed the LORD, at ſundry Times, and in diverſe manners to reveal himſelf, and declare his Will unto His Church*, &c. 3*dly*. That the only Means whereby ſuch a Knowledge is had, are the Revelations made to the Church under the Old and New Teſtaments: But if the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence objectively reveal GOD to be reconcilable. Then, 1*ſt*. They are Means of giving the Knowledge of GOD that's neceſſary to Salvation; For the Knowledge of GOD as reconcilable, is a Knowledge neceſſary to Salvation. 2*dly*. Then the Means of ſuch a Knowledge are not peculiar to the Church; both which are plainly contrar to the *Paragraph* of the *Confeſſion*.

A ſecond Propoſition he owns, *Page* 77. of his Anſwers, is, *That by the Light of Nature, Works of Creation, and Providence, including Tradition, GOD hath given an obſcure Objective Revelation to all Men, of His being reconcilable to Sinners; which the Heathen may come to the Knowledge of, if they obſerve and conſider it.*

THIS Propoſition hath two Branches, 1*ſt*. That the light of Natute, Works of Creation and Providence, including Tradition, are an objective Revelation to Heathens, of GOD's being Reconcilable to Sinners, to this I would ſay, 1*ſt*. In general if this be not univerſal objective Grace, and a real Call by the Works of Creation and Providence, maintained by *Univerſaliſts*, and condemned by all Orthodox Divines, every indifferent Perſon may judge. 2*ly*. I deſire to know, what he means by *Reconcilable*, for either he muſt underſtand a Reconcilableneſs

cilableneſs, *in Potentia remota, i. e.* a pure and ſimple poſſibility, of being reconciled; and if ſo, this does not anſwer his End; becauſe in that Senſe GOD is reconcilable to fallen Angels, *i. e.* abſtracting from the Decree, and Revelation of his Will; there is no Contradiction in the thing, and in this Senſe GOD was Reconcilable to *Adam* in the interval, betwixt his Fall and the firſt Promiſe, before he had revealled his Purpoſe to provide a Remedy.

OR 2*dly*. He means of a Reconcilableneſs *in Potentia proxima, i. e.* That GOD has ſome way by theſe means, given an Objective Revelation to Heathens of his willingneſs to be reconcil'd to Sinners: And that this is his meaning, ſeems plain. And then I would know, whether the light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, give this objective Revelation, abſtract from Tradition, or only in Conjunction with it; if the laſt be affirmed, then it's only Tradition gives this objective Revelation, if ſo be, they cannot give it without Tradition. If the firſt, *i. e.* The light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, give ſome faint objective Revelation of this by themſelves, tho' not ſo clear, when joined with Tradition; then this is a Propoſition contrary to *Scripture*, and the *Analogy of Faith*. For 1*ſt*. GOD is not reconcilable, but in CHRIST, and nothing but the Word gives this Revelation; Therefore it is called *the Word of Reconciliation*, 2 *Cor*. 5. 19. which plainly imports, that this is peculiar to the Word. The *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap*. 1. *Par*: 1. Speaking of the means of the Knowledge of GOD, neceſſary to Salvation, condeſcends only on the means, given to the Church, under the Old and New Teſtament

ſtament. 3*ly*. The Works of Creation and Providence, can diſcover no more of GOD, than they would have done before, when there was no need of Reconciliation: If they be means of giving this Reconciliation, we muſt needs read of a new Inſtitution, appointing them means for that End; For ſure they are not Natural Means. 4*ly*. *Adam* by all the Helps he had in the Interval betwixt his Fall, and the firſt Goſpel promiſe, could have never known ſo much; And we may rationally ſuppoſe That GGD might have delayed for ſome time, revealing to *Adam* his Purpoſe of providing a Remedy. Can they now diſcover any more to Heathens, than they would have done to *Adam* in that Interval? 5*ly*. Reconcilableneſs belonging to a Supernatural, or Goſpel Order of things, muſt needs be a pure Object of Faith, and our Faith of it, muſt needs be ſome way bottomed, upon the means that diſcover Reconcilableneſs: And therefore if the light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, reveal GOD to be Reconcilable; They are a partial Foundation of Faith, and the means of begetting it; But I ever thought, that Faith had been only bottomed upon the Revealed Word, and that it was only by the Word, Faith was wrought, as is plain from Scripture. *Pſal.* 119. 49. *Rom.* 10. 14. 6*ly*. We cannot gather what Heathens may know by the light of Nature; Becauſe we enjoying the light of the Goſpel, are capable to improve better, and draw more Conſequences from the Light of Nature, Works of Creation, *&c.* than Heathens, who never heard of a Goſpel.

2. As to *Tradition* he ſtill includes, 1*ſt*. I take it to be but a fair Cover; for it doth not help the Matter

Matter much. 2*dly*. I would have it obſerved, That the Authors he cites, as of the ſame Judgment with him, ſpeak not one word of *Tradition*: So that if theſe Teſtimonies prove any thing, they will prove, that the light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, without Tradition reveal GOD to be reconcilable, which is more than he affirms. 3*ly*. I would know what he means by *Tradition*, for I can underſtand nothing by it, but ſome general hints, in more or leſs of GOD's being Reconcilable, handed down from one Generation to another by Word of Mouth. And therefore, 4*thly*. If ſo, this ſome way belongs to Scripture Revelation, and ſhould not be claſſed with the light of Nature, Works of Creation, *&c.* 5*thly*. I would know if this *Tradition* be ſtill among all Heathens, who never heard of a Preached Goſpel; if it be, then I want to know how he proves it; for it ſeems to be a bold Aſſertion: And further it will follow, that they know actually that GOD is Reconcilable, becauſe Tradition in it's Nature includes this, being nothing but ſome darker report of GOD's being Reconcilable, handed down by Word of Mouth, from one Generation to another, which I think he doth not affirm. If *Tradition* be now loſt among the Heathen, why does *he add including Tradition*? For then the light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, without *Tradition*, muſt give this Objective Revelation of GOD's being Reconcilable, which he does not here affirm. 6*ly*. Might not one upon the ſame Grounds alledge, That there is not only ſome dark *Tradition* concerning GOD's being Reconcilable; but alſo, concerning a Remedy's being actually provided, and

Juſtice

Juſtice ſatisfied, as alſo, concerning the Perſon of the Redeemer. The laſt may be proven as eaſily as the firſt, and the Reaſons diſproving the the laſt, will as effectually diſprove the firſt.

CONCERNING *Tradition*, we offer theſe two or three Conſiderations, *1ſt.* We are to diſtinguiſh betwixt *Tradition, as to the Matter of Fact, and Tradition as to Doctrine.* As to the firſt it's poſſible, that ſomething might be handed down for many Generations among Heathens, as concerning the Deluge; But as to *Traditions Doctrinal*, it's plain, they are intirely loſt amongſt Heathens. *2ly. Tradition Doctrinal*, either relates to Truths belonging to the order of Nature and moral Law; ſomething of that may poſſibly be found among wild Heathens, tho' ſeveral of them have been found to have very little of the Exerciſe of Reaſon, or it may relate to Goſpel Truths; theſe being Supernatural in their Nature, and above Natural Reaſon, are now utterly loſt among them. *3ly.* We are to diſtinguiſh betwixt *Heathens living not long after the Flood, and Heathen Nations, now Living in Remote Corners of the World.* Now ſome dark hints might be preſerved among Heathens for ſome few Ages after the Flood, which, after ſeveral Thouſand Years by the Careleſneſs of intermediate Generations are utterly loſt. *4ly.* We are to diſtinguiſh betwixt *Heathens that live not very far from the Church, and ſuch Heathens, who by reaſon of their remoteneſs, never heard of a Church.* There can be nothing among the laſt like *Tradition*. *5ly.* We are to diſtinguiſh betwixt *an external Rite*, and *a Doctrine.* As to the firſt, it is poſſible that a Rite originally of a Divine Inſtitution, may be found among Heathens, when

the

the Doctrine it was designed to signify, is utterly lost: And in that case, such a Rite is no more an Objective Revelation of Gospel Doctrine, among such a People, than any other superstitious Rite used by them.

THE Second Branch of the *second Proposition* is, *That if the Heathens would improve and consider the light of Nature, Works of Creation, Providence and Tradition, they might come to know, that GOD is reconcilable.* As to this branch, *First*, I would know, if the Heathen can so improve the light of Nature, Works of Creation, *&c.* as to know actually that GOD is reconcilable. If they cannot so improve the forementioned Helps. 1*st*. To what purpose is such an objective Revelation given to them? For certainly the means of Knowledge are never altogether ineffectual as to their End, in regard of all and every one to whom they are given; For would it not reflect upon GOD's Wisdom, if the Gospel means were utterly ineffectual as to all who enjoy them? 2*ly*. How is it true, what he says, *That the Heathen may come to the Knowledge of GOD's being reconcilable, if they improve and consider the foresaid Means*? 3*ly*. How does he answer his own Design, *viz.* To take off the Force of the *Arminian* Objections against us, drawn from Man's utter Impotency. 4*ly*. How are the Heathen rendered more inexcusable, or obliged to seek after further Discoveries of GOD: If they cannot improve these Helps, they already enjoy.

2. IF they can, so improve these helps, so as to know GOD is reconcilable, then, 1st. It deserves to be considered, if this be not the same with the *Arminian* Doctrine, of the *Sufficiency of Natural Rea-*

son

ſon to ſave Men, viz. either *directly* or *indirectly*, viz. if the Heathen improve the helps they have, GOD will reveal the Goſpel unto them, or ſave them for CHRIST's Sake, tho' they never knew him. See *Turret*: *part* 1*ma*. *Quæſt*. 4*ta*. Nor will the including of *Tradition* mend the Matter, as we ſhewed. And I ſuppoſe, *Arminians*, will eaſily take in that too. 2*ly*. It deſerves to be conſidered, if this does not too much exalt the power of Mens free Will, to aſſert that Heathens can ſo improve theſe helps: Sure it does not ſeem ſo agreeable to the Doctrine of Original Sin; Or the Deſcription of Mans natural Enmity and Impotency as to the doing of any good, See *Gen*. 6. 5. *Rom*: 3. 9, 10, 11. *Rom*: 8. 7. 1 *Cor*. 2. 14. 3*ly*. By this it would ſeem the ſtate of Heathens, is not ſo hopeleſs as the *Scripture* Repreſents, *Eph*. 2. 12. If it be in their power to do that, upon which infallibly follows their knowledge, not only of GOD's being reconcilable in general, but alſo of the way in particular, how: For both theſe are aſſerted by him in anſwer to the *Fourth Propoſition*, *Pag*: 80. And what more do the Profeſſors of the Goſpel know? 4*ly*. This ſeems to make the light of Nature ſufficient to give the Heathen ſuch a Knowledge of GOD, as is neceſſary to Salvation; at leaſt Mediatly ſufficient: For he ſays, *That if the Heathen would improve the forementioned helps, they might know that GOD is Reconcilable, and alſo the way how*. For this he aſſerts in his 4*th*. Propoſition. And I do not know, if the *Firſt Paragraph of Chap*: 1. of the *Confeſſion of Faith*, will allow of that Diſtinction, *Mediate* and *Immediate Sufficiency*.

As for the Sacrifices the Heathens did offer,

we give these Considerations, 1*st* If they prove any thing, they will prove the Heathens did actually know, that GOD was Reconcilable, which Mr. *Simson* does not affirm. 2*ly*. The impressions of a simple Possibility of Reconciliation, might be the Foundation of all they did this way. 3*ly*. It may be a Question whether all of them offered them as Sacrifices to atone their Gods, or only as simple and absolute Services? 4*ly*. It's a Question, whether these Sacrifices are still in use among all Heathens? 5*ly*. The case of the Heathen that lived near the *Jews*, and about these times, vastly differs from the Heathen now living in the remote places of *America*, nor answers his design where Tradition is now utterly lost. *Lastly*, a Rite or Ceremony Originally of a Divine Institution may remain among Heathens, where the Doctrine of which it was a Seal and Confirmation is intirely lost; And in that case it is no more an objective Revelation of GOD's Reconcilableness, than a Wax Seal is a Confirmation of the Charter, to which it was appended, where the Charter it self is lost or destroyed.

A Third *Proposition* he owns, is, *That the Heathen may know, that there is a Remedy for sin provided*: Only he denies, That he affirms they know so much. And says, *Pag:* 79. of his Defences, *That this Proposition is discovered to the Heathen the same way with the former; Because if GOD be Reconcilable to Sinners, He hath from Eternity Provided a Remedy for Sin.*

Now I suppose this is strange Doctrine in this Church. For, 1*st*. If they may know so much, they must have the means of coming at the Knowlegde of it; And if so, these must be either the Word, but this they are supposed to want. 2*ly*. Or it must be

their

their natural Reaſon: But natural Reaſon cannot gather, that a Remedy is provided without ſome objective Revelation of the ſame. 3*ly*. It muſt be the Works of Creation and Providence: But for my part I cannot underſtand by what conſequence it can be drawn from theſe, that a Remedy is provided; For what is it in theſe, ſince the firſt Revelation of the Goſpel, more than before the Fall, or in the Interval betwixt the Fall and the firſt Promiſe, that diſcover a Remedy is provided; and might not GOD have left Mankind after they Fell, for ſome Hundreds of Years, without letting them know that a Remedy was deſigned; There is no more abſurdity in this, than in GOD's leaving ſome Heathen Nations for ſome Thouſands of Years, without the Goſpel. Now could Men in that Interval know, that a Remedy was provided. There would have been as much in the Works of Creation and Providence then, as now to diſcover that. Again I would know, if the Works of Creation and Providence without Tradition, diſcover that a Remedy is provided: If they can diſcover ſo much, then the former Difficulty recurs, if they cannot; then the whole ſtreſs of knowing that a Remedy is provided, is bottom'd upon Tradition, and the Works of Creation and Providence, are not means of knowing this: And then why puts he in the Works of Creation and Providence, and what becomes of Heathen, with whom Tradition is utterly loſt? For ſo the only mean of revealing that a Remedy is provided muſt be Tradition; This we have conſidered above. Beſides, 1*ſt*. It is falſe, for never any Tradition of a Remedy's being provided, was ever obſerved by Travellers to

be among Heathens. And it's certain, that Tradition as to a Remedy in general, is no leſs loſt among the Heathen, than Tradition, as to a Remedy in particular; And no wonder, ſince ſo little of the Knowledge of GOD in general, as GOD, and as a Creator, is found among them. 2*ly*. It proves too much, *viz*. That they actually know that a Remedy is provided, as we hinted formerly.

SECONDLY, if the Heathen may know that a Remedy is provided, I would know if ever any did come to know actually ſo much. This he ſays he doth not affirm, nor can any Inſtance be given of any Heathen that ever came to know, that a Remedy was provided: And is it not ſtrange, that the means to know a Remedy is provided, ſhould be altogether ineffectual to that End, when yet they are not ſo, as to bring in the Heathen to ſome Knowledge of GOD as a Creator, Preſerver and Ruler. *Rom:* 1. 19, 20. 3*dly*. I would know whence it is, that never any of them came actually to know that a Remedy is provided; it muſt either flow from want of power, to improve the objective Revelation they enjoy, or from a wilful and ſupine negligence, in not improving that objective Revelation. If the firſt be affirmed, I want to know what advantage they have by that objective Revelation, and how they are thereby rendered inexcuſable. As alſo, how it is true what he ſays, that they may know a Remedy is provided. If the ſecond be affirmed, then Heathens have a Power, and Free Will to improve that objective Revelation, ſo as to come actually to know a Remedy is provided. And in that caſe, 1*ſt*. Any may judge, if this does not Exalt the power of Mens Free Will, above what the

the Scripture deſcribes it to be; For ſo it ſeems the underſtanding of Heathen is not ſo dark, nor their Wills ſo impotent as the Scriptures affirm. 2*ly*. It would be conſidered, if this be not the ſame with the *Arminian* Doctrine, *viz*. That if Men improve the Light of Nature and other helps Providence puts in their Hand, GOD would reveal the Goſpel unto them. 3*ly*. Never any of the Heathen ſo improved this objective Revelation, as he himſelf owns, and we can only know the ſtrength of a Power by its Actings. True it is, That in Acts of the ſame kind, Men hardly ever act to the outmoſt of what they might do; but to ſay, that Men have a Power as to a certain ſpecies of Acts, and yet never to Exerce any of theſe Acts, is a vaſtly different caſe.

4. He ſays, That this *Objective Revelation*, or the third *Propoſition is manifeſtly a part of the Goſpel; but ſo ſmall, as is no ways ſufficient to Salvation, ſee page* 79. *of his Anſwers*. But 1*ſt*, This that a Remedy is provided being a Fundamental part of the Goſpel, which *Paul* ſays was hid from former Ages, *Eph*. 3. 5. not only as to a Remedy in particular, but alſo in general. It is ſtrange if the Heathen by the Light of Nature be in a capacity to know this. 2*dly*. If it be a part, tho, a ſmall part of the Goſpel; then it ſeems the Heathen are not altogether without the Goſpel, and conſequently not altogether without the Covenant of Grace, nor without Hope, which I would think ſounds a little harſh. 3*dly*, I cannot underſtand how according to him it is not ſufficient to Salvation; for if it be in Heathens Power, *to know a Remedy is provided, and to ſeek after the particular*

way

way how GOD is reconcilable, and if GOD thereupon would reveal the particular way to them; both which he affirms: I ſee not what hinders it to be ſufficient for Salvation: For certainly that *Revelation*, which tho' general and obſcure in it ſelf, yet if *rightly improven* (which he ſays Heathens may do) brings in a full and particular Revelation of the way of Salvation, may well enough be called ſufficient for Salvation: For tho' a little Stock in a Man's Hand be (conſidered in it ſelf) inſufficient to ſubſiſt him, yet if it be ſuppoſed that it is in a Merchants Power, ſo to Trade with it, as thereby to make ſo much Gain, as ſufficiently to maintain him; will any deny that little Stock to be ſufficient to ſubſiſt him. 5*thly*, He calls this *an implicite Revelation of the Goſpel*; But I ever thought, there had been no Revelation of the Goſpel but by the Scriptures, and it ſeems there is a third Diſpenſation of the Goſpel, diſtinct from that under the Old and New Teſtament; and diſtinct Means of revealing the Goſpel, make diſtinct Diſpenſations; but we may touch a little upon this afterwards. *Page 79:* of his Anſwers, he denies, that this Propoſition is contrar to the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap: 7: Par*: 5: *and 6.* His Reaſon is, Becauſe *this Objective Revelation of GOD's being reconcilable, and having provided ſome Remedy for ſin, which he ſays, is given to the Heathen, doth neither teach them Chriſt, the only Remedy, nor the Covenant of Grace, which is the method of applying that Remedy; And therefore cannot teach them either the one, or the other of the Diſpenſations of the Covenant of Grace*; But this Anſwer ſeems to be a plain Shift: For 1*ſt*. Theſe *Paragraphs* of

of the *Confeſſion of Faith* aſſert clearly, that there are only two Diſpenſations of the Covenant of Grace. 2*dly*, He aſſerts as plainly, That this Objective Revelation, is an implicite Revelation of the Goſpel, and yet diſtinct from the Revelation of the Goſpel, under both Diſpenſations of the Covenant of Grace; And therefore it muſt be a third and diſtinct Diſpenſation: For here are three diſtinct Objective Revelations of the Goſpel. The firſt is an Implicite Objective Revelation of the Goſpel by the Light of Nature, Works of Creation, *&c.* Extending to all Heathen. The ſecond is a Revelation under the Law by Sacrifices, *&c.* Still dark, but clearer than the former. The third is a Revelation of the Goſpel by Chriſt's own coming in the Fleſh, the cleareſt of all. Sure here are three diſtinct Mediums of revealing the Goſpel, and conſequently three diſtinct Diſpenſations of the Covenant of Grace; for what makes a diſtinct Diſpenſation, but a diſtinct Medium of revealing; And doth he not ſay, *page* 115. of *his Defences*, That there is an obſcure diſcovery and offer of Grace made to all without the Church. And *page* 80. That the Heathen are ſome way under the Covenant of Grace. Now if they have an offer, tho' obſcure, and be ſome way under the Covenant of Grace, it muſt needs be by virtue of ſome Diſpenſation, which can be no other than his Objective Revelation.

AGAIN if it be an Implicite Revelation of the Goſpel, it muſt needs teach them Chriſt implicitely, and the Covenant implicitely, and the way of Redemption through his Death implicitely; which is plainly to aſſert a third and diſtinct

ſtinct Diſpenſation of the Covenant of Grace, or elſe that the Heathen are under the ſame Diſpenſation of the Covenant with us, or a darker Branch thereof; both which come to one Thing, and make the Covenant of Grace to be univerſal. Laſtly, it is ſtrange he calls *this Objective Revelation of GOD's being reconcilable, a ſmall part of the Goſpel, becauſe not ſufficient to Salvation*: For is a Fundamental part of the Goſpel a ſmall part thereof? as this is. Or is Chriſt's being GOD-MAN a ſmall part of the Goſpel? though in it ſelf not ſufficient to Salvation. He denys this *third Propoſition*, to be contrary to *Eph: chap:* 2: which deſcribes the ſtate of Heathens without the Goſpel; becauſe according to his Opinion, *notwithſtanding of this Objective Revelation of GOD's being Reconcilable, they may ſlight it, and live in groſs Idolatry and wickedneſs, and ſo never attain unto the neceſſary Knowledge of the way of Salvation contained in the Covenant of Promiſe.* Secondly, He ſays, *That tho' ſuch, while they live in that ſtate of wickedneſs and ignorance, can have no ſolid hope of Salvation; yet they are not wholly ſecluded from the Covenant, nor put in the ſame ſtate with fallen Angels; ſeing GOD can ſend the Goſpel and Convert them, as he did the* Epheſians *and others*; And ſays, *That as this Propoſition is not contrar to Scripture, ſo it can be proven from it.*

BUT 1*ſt*. I wiſh he had adduced theſe Scriptures, that prove this Propoſition; then we ſhould have underſtood his Mind more fully. 2*dly*. It ſeems according to him, That theſe *Epheſians* were chiefly without Hope, in Regard of their wicked Lives, and not improving the objective Revela-

velation they had, *viz.* by the Light of Nature, Works of Creation, *&c.* wherein he runs croſs to all *Orthodox Interpreters*, who underſtand it firſt, in Regard of their natural and unregenerate Eſtate. And *2thly.* In Regard of the Want of the Means of Salvation, whereby Salvation is applyed, and Hope wrought, which they wanted; if this be not *Arminian* Doctrine, I know not what is ſuch; And this is *Limburgh*'s Gloſs of the Place. See *Limburg: Lib:* 3. *Cap:* 4. *Par:* 17. *3dly.* According to this Gloſs; theſe *Epheſians* were no otherwiſe without Hope, than prophane Chriſtians are, who tho' they enjoy the Means of Grace; yet live in Ignorance and groſs Abominations; which is ſtrange Doctrine indeed. *4ly.* It ſeems then, That if Heathens would not live in ſuch Wickedneſs, they might attain unto the neceſſary Knowledge of Salvation, contained in the Covenants of Promiſe: And ſo Heathens that are moral, are not without all Hope of Salvation; which is alſo new and ſtrange Doctrine. *5ly.* If the Heathen are not wholly ſecluded from the Covenant; then are they ſome Way included in it; which is to make the Covenant of Grace univerſal. For Univerſaliſts and others, who maintain the Univerſality of the Covenant, freely own, That the Heathens have not ſuch a clear Diſcovery, and Offer of the Goſpel as Chriſtians. *6thly.* If his Meaning be, That they are not wholly excluded from it; becauſe GOD can ſend the Goſpel to them, and convert them; he ſays nothing at all: For in the mean Time they are as really without the Covenant, and Goſpel, as if the Goſpel were never to be preached to them

them. They are only *in Statu Poſſibilitatis* that Way: They are not indeed in the ſame Condition with the fallen Angels, *i: e.* Their Caſe is not altogether deſperate; becauſe GOD hath not declared his Will that Way, as to Heathen, as he hath done with Angels that ſinned. But yet 1*ſt.* While the Goſpel is not ſent to them; is not their Condition in it ſelf hopeleſs? Can they ever be ſaved while in that State? 2*dly.* May they not be conceived, to be in a Condition much like *Adam*'s after the fall, and before the Goſpel was revealed to him; for ſuch Heathen can know as little of GOD's Deſign as *Adam* did then.

E'RE I diſmiſs this *third Propoſition*, I muſt make a further Reflection or Two upon his calling it an *implicite Revelation of the Goſpel.* 1*ſt.* I remark, that he calls it *a very ſmall Part of the Goſpel, Page* 79. and yet in the *End of that Paragraph* he ſays, *It's an implicite Revelation of the Goſpel.* It ſeems then, That the Heathen hath an objective Revelation of the whole Goſpel, tho' more implicitely. 2*dly.* It ſeems the Light of Nature is a partial Mean revealing the Goſpel, and ſo by the Light of Nature, Heathens may come to the implicite Knowledge of the Goſpel: But this is plainly to found the Goſpel in Part, upon the Light of Nature; and to make the Light of Nature able to dive into, and take up Goſpel Myſteries. 3*dly.* The Works of Creation and Providence muſt alſo be a partial Mean of revealing the Goſpel: And in that Caſe, the Connection betwixt them as Means, and the Revelation of the Goſpel, muſt either be natural or by a new Inſtitution. The firſt cannot be, becauſe

cauſe they would have revealed the Goſpel to *Adam* before he fell, which is abſurd. They cannot be by a new Inſtitution; for that Appointment muſt either be found in the Word: But then how can it oblige the Heathen to uſe them as Means for that End, who know Nothing of the Word? Or if that Appointment be to be found any where elſe, I am at a Loſs to gueſs where it is to be found. *Finally*, If they be not an implicite Revelation of the Goſpel, without Tradition; then they are no partial objective Revelation thereof at all; and if this implicite Revelation be founded only on Tradition; then to what End doth he join the Works of Creation and Providence as a partial objective Revelation? For ſo they are no Revelation of it at all: Beſides, Tradition is a ſandy Foundation to build this upon. For how is he ſure that Tradition is not utterly loſt among ſeveral Heathen Nations? And if it be, what becomes of his Propoſition? But having touched upon this already, we paſs it.

THERE is one thing I forgot to remark upon his ſecond Propoſition, which is his Anſwer to Mr. *Webſter's* Queſtion, *viz: How is GOD reconcilable to all the Heathen Nations, without Chriſt had ſatisfied Juſtice for them; is not this univerſal Redemption?* To which he anſwers, *pag:* 78. of his Defences, by asking him, *How GOD is reconcilable to all the Chriſtian Nations, unleſs Chriſt had ſatisfied Juſtice for them?* Now *1ſt.* If GOD be reconcilable to Chriſtian Nations *indefinitly*, which Word he adds in his firſt Anſwer, it follows plainly, That Chriſt hath ſatisfied Juſtice for many of them. And therefore, *2dly.* If all the Heathen

may

may know, that GOD is reconcilable to Sinners; it follows plainly, That Chriſt hath ſatisfied Juſtice for ſeveral adult Heathens: And conſequently infers the Infallibility of the Salvation of ſome of them, tho' they never heard of the Goſpel; for he cannot be ſaid to be reconcilable to them, unleſs Chriſt had ſatisfied Juſtice at leaſt for ſome of them.

THE *fourth Propoſition*, which he maintains, is, *That if the Heathen would in Sincerity and Truth, and in the diligent Uſe of the Means, that Providence lays to their Hand, ſeek from GOD, the Knowledge of the Way of Reconciliation, neceſſary for their acceptable ſerving of him, and being ſaved by him, he would diſcover it to them.* And further *pag:* 81. of his *Anſwers*, ſays, *1ſt. It is poſſible, that GOD may make known the Remedy to one Heathen Nation, and not to another; becauſe the one ſought to know the Way of Reconciliation, and the other did not.* 2*dly.* He grants, *He never yet read in any Hiſtory, that ever any Heathen Nation did ſeek after it, or obtain it this Way.* 3*dly.* He adds, *That however, he thinks, that GOD will not deny his Grace to them that ſeek it, in the Way mentioned*; yet upon the other Hand, *He does not think, that GOD never gives his Grace, but to them that ſeek it; and that he never prevents Sinners, both with the Grace and Knowledge of the Goſpel, eſpecially Nations.* And as to Mr. *Rutherford*, he ſays, *That if he be conceived in that Place, cited by Mr.* Webſter, Exam: Armin: *pag:* 447. *&c. to refute this* fourth Propoſition, *or any of the former Propoſitions, as explained by him; that then he differs from him:* And alledges, *That he has as famous Divines for him, who have taught the ſame things he does*: And for this

this End alledges, *Confeſſion of Faith Chap:* 21. *Par:* 1. *2dly.* He alledges *Doctor* Owen, *in his Exercitations prefixed to his Commentary on the Epiſtle to the* Hebrews, *Vol:* 1. *Exercit:* 8. *Parag:* 28. *& Par:* 79. *3dly.* He adduces *Witſius* his *Oeconomia Fœderum, Lib:* 3. *Cap:* 5. *Parag:* 7, 8, 9, 10, *&c.*

Now if this be not *Arminian* Doctrine, I know not what is to be eſteemed ſo. Sure this Doctrine was never taught before in this Church, by *any Profeſſor of Divinity of the Presbyterian Communion.* Doth not *Turrettin* tell us, That ſome *Arminians* teach, the Sufficiency of natural Light for Salvation, in a ſmoother Way than others of their Sort, *viz:* That by uſing the Light of Nature well, Men come to obtain the Light of Grace: And this he cites as the Opinion of *Epiſcopius, Corvinus, Arminius* and *Arnold contra Tilen*: See *Turret: part:* 1*ma. Loc:* 1*mo. Cap:* 4. *Parag:* 1, *et* 12. What Difference is there betwixt this Opinion, and Mr. *Simſon's* fourth Propoſition. See alſo *Limburgh's* Body of Divinity *Lib:* 4: *Cap:* 11*mo. Parag:* 11*mo.* His Words are, ſpeaking of thoſe that uſe common Grace well, *Alterutrum itaque ſtatuendum aut a DEO, licet cognitione Chriſti deſtitutos, donari Salute, non tamen ſine reſpectu ad Chriſtum, ſed ſolummodo propter Chriſtum, aut ſi nullos niſi in Chriſtum credentes, Salutem adepturos velimus, dicendum eos qui Lumine naturali recte utuntur, atque ita ad Fidem in Chriſtum, quando Evangelium ipſis prædicatur, recipiendum præparati, ſic ad Vitam Æternam diſpoſiti ſunt, majore a DEO Gratiæ Luce donandos, et Evangelii cognitione illuſtrandos, ut ita per Fidem in Jeſum Chriſtum Salutem adipiſcantur,* &c. If this laſt Branch be not the ſame with

Mr.

Mr. *Simſon*'s fourth Propoſition, we leave it to the Judgement of any indifferent Perſon.

BUT let us a little conſider this fourth Propoſition. 1*ſt*. I deſire to know, if the Heathen can ſo uſe theſe Means in Sincerity and Truth; if they cannot ſo uſe theſe Means, to what Purpoſe is this Propoſition maintained by him, and how are Heathens thereby rendred more inexcuſable? And how does he anſwer the *Arminian* Objections on this Head? 2*dly*: If it be in their Power, to uſe theſe Means in Sincerity and Truth; then it ſeems Man's Nature is not ſo far debas'd by original Sin, as the Scripture points out to us; ſee *Gen: Chap: 6*: where it's ſaid, *The Imagination of Man's Heart is evil and only evil continually*: But if this be true, then they are able to lay aſide theſe vain Imaginations, and to frame their Hearts to Sincerity and Truth, in the Uſe of theſe Means, and it would ſeem, that the Enmity of the carnal Mind againſt GOD, is not ſo very great, *Rom*: 8. 7. If the Heathen can in the Way of Sincerity and Truth, ſeek after the Way of Reconciliation: Then it ſeems alſo, that the Natural Man is not ſo very uncapable to take up the things of GOD, 1 *Cor*: 2. 14: If it be alledged, That it is only an *Hypotheſis* or Suppoſition, and that tho' it be in their Power, ſo to uſe theſe Means; yet it is certain, they never uſe them ſo, nor will ever do; only this renders them inexcuſable, and clears the Juſtice of GOD. We anſwer, It ſeems ſtrange, that it ſhould be in their Power, ſo to uſe theſe Means, and yet never any of them uſe that Power this Way: For how is the Power known, but by the Exerciſe thereof?

Is

Is it not a good Argument to prove, That no Man can of himſelf believe, without the powerful Drawings of the Spirit; becauſe never Man ſo believed? And do we not ſee, That Heathens have exerciſed the Power they have, to take up GOD in the Works of Creation and Providence, as a Creator, Preſerver and Benefactor, *&c:* *Rom:* 1:19, 20. and downward? So that it is ſtrange, they never exerciſe that Power they have, in a right uſing of the Means Providence lays to their Hands; ſo as to take up GOD as reconcilable, that a Remedy is provided, and to enquire after the particular Way, how: It's true, Men never do all that's in their Power, as to the Degree of the Action; but it is another Caſe, as to a whole *Species* of Actions; to ſay, That ſuch a *Species* of Actions are in the Power of Heathens, and yet they never exerc'd any Action of that *Species*. Again in that Caſe, when they never uſe theſe Means ſo; it muſt needs flow from the Corruption of their Wills and Affections; which is really a very conſiderable Branch of Man's Impotency; and therefore, their not uſing the Means ſo, muſt flow from a Want of Power; unleſs we affirm, That it is in Heathens Power to change their own Wills and Affections, and to lay aſide the Corruptions of both, which would be a pretty bold Aſſertion. Beſides it is too bold in Men, to frame *Hypotheſes* in Divinity, as they do in their Philoſophical Schems, this is of dangerous Conſequence.

2: QUÆRITUR ſince it is in their Power, ſo to uſe theſe Means, and *poſito poſſibili nihil ſequitur abſurdi*, upon ſuppoſition that they uſe theſe Means in Sincerity and Truth; if there be any

ſpecial

ſpecial Grace given to him, that ſo uſes theſe Means, which is not given to another, that neglects the right uſe of theſe Means: If there be ſpecial Grace given, then this deſtroys the Suppoſition; That all the Heathens have it in their Power ſo to improve this objective Revelation; and then how are ſuch inexcuſeable, for not improving that objective Revelation, to whom that ſpecial Grace is denyed. 2*dly*. If no ſpecial Grace be given to him that improveth theſe Means, in Sincerity and Truth, which another neglecting the ſame Means hath not, then ſuch Heathens improving theſe Means in Sincerity and Truth, and conſequently, their obtaining the Knowledge of the particular way of Reconciliation is intirely to be aſcribed to the right uſe of their Free Will. For according to him, the Revelation of the Goſpel follows infallibly upon their ſo uſing this objective Revelation: But if this do not lay a Foundation for Men to glory in themſelves, and be not contrar to 1 *Cor*: 4. 7. any indifferent Perſon may Judge.

3. Either the Heathens uſing theſe Means in Sincerity and Truth, flows from the ſimple uſe of their Reaſon, or from ſome common Grace given to all of them. If the firſt, then Heathens need neither ſpecial nor common Grace to uſe theſe Means in Sincerity and Truth, which I think is but courſe Divinity. If the ſecond, then this is a maintaining of a general and common Grace given to all Mankind, upon the improving of which, Saving Grace is infallibly given: Which is a Doctrine condemned by the Reformed Churches, and is of a peice with Univerſality of

of the Covenant of Grace, and of Chriſt's Death.

4. QUÆR. Whether ever any of the Heathens did ſo uſe theſe Means in Sincerity and Truth? This he doth not affirm, only he ſays, *It's poſſible*; Now if never any of them ſo uſed this objective Revelation, muſt it not ſeem ſtrange, ſince according to him, it's in their Power, and they need not any ſpecial Grace for that End, and alſo ſeing we read concerning ſeverals of them, who one would think came a pretty good length in Morals, and ſome Things like Sincerity, and good Diſpoſitions towards a Deity, and Virtue; for how is the Power of an Agent known but by the Actions he produces.

5. THIS puts the obtaining of the Knowledge of the Goſpel, and ſo of Converſion intirely in the Power of Heathens Free Will, at leaſt indirectly: For if the right uſe of the Means upon which the Revelation of the Goſpel, and ſo Converſion is given, be in their Power; then theſe alſo are in their Power: For if a poor Man have a ſure Promiſe of getting as much Money as will pay his Debt, upon his but ſeeking of it, will any deny that it is in ſuch a Man's Power, when ever he pleaſes to pay his Debt.

6. I would know where this Promiſe of GOD's revealing the particular Way of Salvation to Heathens upon their uſing this objective Revelation in Sincerity and Truth is to be found: For either it is to be found in the Works of Creation and Providence; but he owns, That theſe do not diſcover the Way of Salvation in particular, only in general, *that GOD is Reconcilable*; or it is to be found in *Tradition*; but will he ſay, That ever

ſuch a Promiſe of revealing the Way of Salvation in particular, was found handed down among the Heathen, who never heard of a Goſpel: Or *thirdly* is it to be found in Scripture; if ſo, to what end are ſuch conditional Promiſes made to Heathen? who in the ſtate in which they are ſuppoſed to be can never know of ſuch a Promiſe, or conſequently be obliged, or moved by them to ſuch an uſe of theſe Means.

7. I want to know what it is that is promiſed; for it is either only the External Revelation of the Goſpel, or alſo the Internal Revelation thereof. If the firſt, it muſt either be immediately revealed to them, or by ſending Miniſters to Preach to them; for either of which I would ſee ſolid Grounds. If the ſecond, then the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, &c. are the Means of Converſion, which deſtroys the neceſſity of the Word. *2dly*. Then the Condition of Heathens is as hopeful as that of Chriſtians; For it's no leſs in the Power of Heathens to uſe the Means Providence puts in their Hands with Sincerity and Truth, than it is in the Power of Chriſtians, to uſe Goſpel Means with Moral Seriouſneſs. And if Heathens ſo uſe theſe Means, which he ſays, it's in their Power to do; GOD will according to him, infallibly reveal the Goſpel to them, and convert them. If this be not dangerous Doctrine I know not what is ſuch.

He ſays, *It's poſſible that GOD may reveal the Goſpel to one Nation, and not to another; becauſe the firſt did ſeek after the particular Way of Reconciliation, which the other did not.* Now, *poſito poſſibili nihil ſequitur abſurdi.* And then in that Caſe,

First,

First, Would not ſuch a Nation have Ground of glorying. 2*dly*. In that Caſe GOD would not prevent ſuch a Nation with the offer of his Grace, but would be found of them, becauſe they ſought him firſt; which is contrar to *Scripture*, which ever deſcribes the coming of the Goſpel among a People to preventing Grace, as is plain from, *Iſai*: 65. 1: *Luk*: 1: 78: *Act*: 13: 26. *To you is this Word of Salvation ſent*, Tit: 2: 11: *The Grace of GOD, which bringeth Salvation*, &c: 3*dly*: In the ſame Manner it's poſſible, that a whole profeſſing National Church, may be really converted; becauſe they uſed the Means with moral Seriouſneſs; and according to him, it's as much in their Power, to uſe the outward Means ſo, as it's in the Power of a Pagan Nation, to ſearch after the particular Way of Reconciliation in Sincerity and Truth; but I ſuppoſe this would be uncouth Doctrine.

THAT this Propoſition is contrar to the *Confeſſion of Faith*, is plain, *From Chap: 9. Par*: 3. *and* 4. which ſays, *That Men being wholly averſe to Good, and dead in Sin, not only cannot convert themſelves, but alſo cannot prepare themſelves thereunto*. Now, if the Heathen can ſeek after the particular Way of Reconciliation, and GOD thereupon reveal it to them, do they not much to prepare themſelves for Converſion; And tho' the Heathen cannot be ſaved by the Religion they live in, yet if that be a part of their Religion to ſeek after the particular way of Reconciliation, as he ſays, it's poſſible for them to do; And if they be alſo obliged to enquire after the particular Way, by Vertue of that objective Revelation, in that Caſe, is not the Religion of ſuch ſufficient to ſave them, at leaſt Mediately

ately? Becauſe it infallibly ſecures to them the Revelation of the Goſpel, which I would think is *Arminian* Doctrine.

THAT place of the *Confeſſion of Faith* cited by him, *Chap.* 21. *Par.* 1. Anſwers not his Purpoſe: To clear which, we ſhall firſt ſet down the Words of the *Confeſſion of Faith*, which are as follow, *The light of Nature ſheweth, that there is a GOD, who hath Lordſhip and Sovereignity over all, is Good, and doth Good unto all, and is therefore to be Feared, Loved, Praiſed, Called upon, Truſted in, and ſerved with all the Heart, and with all the Soul, and with all the Might, &c.* Now in Anſwer to this, we offer theſe Conſiderations. *1ſt.* If it prove any thing, it would prove too much, *viz:* that by the light of Nature without Tradition, Heathens may come to know the particular way of Reconciliation; For that *Paragraph* ſpeaks not a Word of Tradition, on which he lays ſo much ſtreſs, only of the light of Nature; and yet he charges Mr. *Webſter* to prove, that he ſaid, *Heathens may come to know this, by the meer Light of Nature.* *2dly.* That *Paragraph* ſpeaks not one Word of the Light of Nature's revealing, that there is a Remedy provided, or that GOD is Reconcilable; far leſs that Heathens can improve that Light of Nature in Sincerity and Truth, and that thereupon GOD will reveal that way unto them; for the proving of which, this place is adduced by him, only it ſays, *That the Light of Nature reveals, there is a GOD who hath Lordſhip and Sovereignity over all, is Good and doth Good unto all, and therefore is to be feared, loved, &c.* Now this is no more than what the Moral Law, ſimply as a Law reveals, and did reveal to *Adam*, both

both before he fell, and in the Interval betwixt his Fall and the firſt Goſpel Promiſe; But the Moral Law as ſuch, reveals nothing of a Remedy, or GOD's being Reconcilable; and therefore the Law as a Law, cannot oblige ſuch to truſt for Pardon of Sin, without a ſuperadded Revelation; otherways if the Light of Nature obliges them to truſt GOD for the Pardon of Sin, and Renovation of Heart and Life, the Light of Nature muſt ſome way reveal and offer Pardon of Sin, and a new Heart; for that *Paragraph* ſpeaks only of the Light of Nature; but I would think this is ſtrange Doctrine. 3*dly*. The Truſt to which the Light of Nature obliges Heathens, is general, according to the Revelation by the Light of Nature, and the Moral Law as a Law; And this Revelation with a ſimple Poſſibility of Reconciliation, may warrand them to truſt GOD for Pardon, as a thing not ſimply impoſſible; but doth not infer any thing of a Revelation of GOD's Will as to Reconciliation; far leſs that a Remedy is provided; Becauſe the ſimple Poſſibility of Reconciliation flows not from His Will, but from the Goodneſs of his Nature. 4*thly*. The Light of Nature being upon the Matter the ſame with the Moral Law (at *firſt*) given to *Adam* obliges him to his Duty, abſtract from his Impotency to obey, ſince contracted, being given to Man in Innocency; and after contracted Weakneſs, does not diſcharge Man from his Obligation to obey; otherwiſe it would follow, That Heathens are now under no Law. *Finally*, If becauſe the Light of Nature obliges Heathen to truſt in GOD, it follows, That it's in their Power ſo to do: It will alſo follow, That

it

it is in the Power of Heathen, *To ſerve him with all the Heart, Soul and Might*: Becauſe that Paragraph in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, ſays, *The Light of Nature not only reveals, that GOD is to be truſted in, but alſo to be ſerved with all the Heart, Soul and Might*: Which I much doubt, if Mr. *Simſon* will affirm.

NEXT, he names two Divines, as of the ſame Judgment with himſelf: The firſt is *Doctor Owen, Vol*: 1. on the *Hebrew*, *Exercit*: 8. *Parag*: 28. The Words are, *That all the falſe Worſhip, which the Generality of Men apoſtatized unto, was laid in a general Perſwaſion, that there was a Way for the Recovery of the Favour of GOD; but what that was, they knew not; and therefore wandered in woful Uncertainties*. Now for Anſwer to this, we offer theſe following Conſiderations. 1*ſt*. Doctor *Owen* in that Place, doth not aſſert, That it was in their Power, to improve the Means Providence laid to their Hands; far leſs, that GOD would reveal the particular Way of Reconciliation unto them, nor doth he affirm, That the Heathen can ſeek after the particular Way of Reconciliation in Sincerity and Truth; for which End this Teſtimony is cited by him out of Doctor *Owen*. 2*dly*. This Teſtimony, if it prove any thing, it will prove more than Mr. *Simſon* affirms, *viz*., That the Heathen do actually know, that a Remedy for ſin is provided: For to be perſwaded, That there is a way for Recovery of the Favour of GOD, is the very ſame with knowing, that a Remedy for Sin is provided; which in his third Propoſition, he refuſes that he affirms. 3*dly*. He ſpeaks not a Word of Tradition, which Mr. *Simſon*

ſon ſtill takes in. 4*thly*. The Words may very well be underſtood of a Perſwaſion, that a Way of Recovery was poſſible; a Perſwaſion of which might well enough lay a Foundation for all that the Heathen did this Way. 5*thly*. Mr. *Owen* ſeems to ſpeak of the Heathen, who lived in the firſt Ages of the World, and near the *Jewiſh* Church, among whom, ſome dark Remains of the Truth might continue, tho' buried in the Rubbiſh of many Superſtitions: But the Caſe differs as to Heathen, who live now, and in the outmoſt Corners, among whom any Tradition of that Kind is utterly loſt.

THE ſecond Place he cites out of *Owen*, is, *Exercit*: 8. *Parag*: 15. *Pag*: 79. The Words are, *To what End ſhall we conceive the Providence, and Patience of GOD towards Mankind, for ſo long a Seaſon in the Earth? Shall we now think, That GOD hath no other Deſign in his Patience towards Mankind, for ſo many Generations; but meerly to ſuffer them all to ſin againſt him, and at length everlaſtingly deſtroy them*, &c? Now it follows not, becauſe this was the Deſign of GOD's Patience, this way towards the Heathen; that therefore this Patience was an objective Revelation of GOD's Deſign to provide a Remedy; far leſs that from this they could gather, that a Remedy was provided: And leaſt of all, That GOD would reveal the particular Way, upon their uſing the Means; otherwiſe Men were obliged to know all the Deſigns of GOD's Providences towards them, and it were their Sin, if they did not; which is harſh Doctrine, and contrary to *John* 13. 7. where Chriſt ſay to *Peter*, *What I do now thou knoweſt not*. 2*dly*. Mr.

Mr. *Owen* in the Beginning of that Paragraph, is proving, That GOD hath not left all Mankind to periſh: For proving of which, he draws an Argument from GOD's Patience towards the Heathen: But he does not in the leaſt hint, that the Heathen can know any thing of that Deſign.

As little are the Words following in the ſame 79 *Page* to his Purpoſe, *from GOD's requiring from Men a Revenue of Glory by Way of Worſhip preſcribed to them*: For this indeed proves, That ſuch to whom he has preſcribed a Way of Worſhip, may know ſo much; but can be no Argument for them, to whom GOD hath preſcibed no Way of Worſhip ſince the Fall; as it is with Heathen. See *Pſal:* 147: 20: For Mr. *Owen* ſpeaks there of the Viſible Church, as is plain to any that reads that Place: And I would know, what Kind of Worſhip GOD has preſcribed to Heathen, except what the Light of Nature teaches them in it's dark Remains.

THE next Divine he cites, is *Witſius* in his *Oeconom: Federis, Lib:* 3. *Cap:* 5. *Parag:* 7. *Externa vocatio aliquatenus peragitur Verbo Naturæ.* Et *Parag:* 8. *Sed multis modis inclamat Homini, ut rerum terrenarum nimia cura et cultu objecto, ad meliora cœleſtia et æterna anhelet. Et Parag:* 9. *Ita naturæ voce invitantur Homines, ut quærerent DEUM: Si forte palpando ipſum invenient. Et Parag:* 10. *Neque modo ad quærendum ſeſe, DEUS per Naturam Homines, invitat, ſed aliquam potiundi ſibi ſpem ſuppeditat.* But *Firſt*, *Witſius* here ſpeaks not one Word of Tradition, which Mr. *Simſon* carefully puts in the Propoſition; ſo that it will prove more than he dare aſſert: *Viz.* That by the

the ſimple Light of Nature without Tradition, Heathen may come to know the particular Way of Reconciliation. 2*dly*. *Witſius* ſays not, That the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence reveal that a Remedy is provided; far leſs that they can improve theſe Means in Sincerity and Truth; only that they are called thereby to ſeek after GOD, *viz.* in general, and after Heavenly Things. Now the Works of Creation and Providence would have called Man to this, tho' he had not fallen; yea, would have obliged him to all this, tho' the Revelation of the firſt Goſpel Promiſe had been for ſome Time delayed. 3*dly*. All that the Heathen are hereby called to, amounts to no more, than what the moral Law as ſuch obliges them to, as is plain: For the moral Law as ſuch, obliges them to every Particular ſpecified in the foreſaid Teſtimonies; but the moral Law as ſuch, reveals Nothing of GOD's Reconcilableneſs, or of a Remedy. 4*thly*. *Witſius* in the End of 14. *Parag:* of that 5 *Chap*. ſays expreſly, That there is no Preaching of the Goſpel by the Works of Nature; which how it agrees with Mr. *Simſon*'s objective Revelation, and the Heathens being ſome Way under the Covenant of Grace, I cannot ſo well underſtand. But any that will read the 13, 14, 15. *Parags*: of that 5 *Chap*: will eaſily ſee how he wreſts theſe Citations beyond the Intention of the Author, but becauſe it would be too tedious to tranſcribe them at large, I refer to the Book it ſelf.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Concerning ELECTION.

UPon this Head, there are Theſe Propoſitions he refuſeth as his. As *1ſt. Pag*: 85. *That in the Predeſtination of others, to the Illuſtration of the Glory of Mercy, they are not only conſidered as miſeable Sinners, but alſo as inveſted with all theſe Qualities, which make them meet for the Illuſtration of the Glory of Mercy.* This Propoſition he refuſes as his, and ſays, *He can make no Senſe of it.*

A Second Propoſition he diſowns as his, is, *viz. That they being conſidered as thus made meet for the Illuſtration of his Glory and Mercy, he predeſtinated them, for that very End.* Page 86.

A Third Propoſition he refuſeth as his, is, *That the Decree of giving regenerating Grace to moſt of People, is upon GOD's Fore-ſight of their uſing the Means when others do not.*

A Fourth Propoſition he ſays is not his, is, *That Perſons, who are foreſeen to believe, are the Objects of Election.*

FIFTHLY, He refuſeth this Propoſition to be his, *viz. That in his Order of the Decrees, CHRIST and his Merits is an incident Propoſition.*

SIXTHLY, He alſo refuſeth this Propoſition as his, *That CHRIST's Merits, are the meritorious Cauſe of Election, or why any are elected.*

2. WHAT he maintains upon this Subject, he delivers it in the following Heads, as *1ſt.* He maintains *Page* 87: with the learned *Dr: Owen, That there are ſome Attributes of GOD, which as to their first*

firſt Exerciſe ad extra, *require no Object antecedently exiſting, much leſs Objects ſo and ſo qualified; ſuch are the Power and Wiſdom of GOD, in making the World. And* 2dly: *There are other Properties of GOD, which cannot be exerciſed* ad extra, *according to their Nature, without a Suppoſition of an antecedent Object, and that qualified in ſuch and ſuch a Manner, ſuch are his vindictive Juſtice and pardoning Mercy.*

2. HE ſays, *That in following that Rule,* quod eſt primum in Intentione, ultimum eſt in Excutione, *he conſiders two Parts in the Decree, the one determining the full and adequate End*; viz. *The Glory of all the Divine Perfections, which are to be manifeſted by the whole Works of GOD. The ſecond Part comprehends the full and adequate Means for attaining that End, namely the whole Works of Creation, Providence and Redemption.*

3. AS to that Part of the Decree relating to Man's Salvation, He ſays, Page 88: *He conceives thus.* 1ſt. *The adequate End of the whole Work of Redemption, is the Manifeſtation of all the Divine Perfections diſcoverable by it.* 2dly: *The adequate Means of Glorifying theſe Perfections of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are all eſtabliſhed, and unchangeably determined; and their Relations with Reſpect to one another are alſo fixed.* 3dly: *That the Atributes of GOD to be manifeſted by this Part of his Decree, being ſuch as require Objects particularly fitted and qualified, the Objects thereof are conſidered as duely prepared by the Exerciſe of thoſe other Attributes of GOD, which require no preexiſtent or qualified Object.* 4thly, *That he chooſeth a certain Number out the ſinful Maſs of Mankind, equally ſinful and miſe-*

rable

rable, whom he gives to his Son appointed Mediator to be ſaved by him. 5thly: He ſays, *The Election of ſome to Salvation, muſt needs be ſubordinate to the conſtituting CHRIST, Mediator; it being a Mean to manifeſt his Mediatory Glory in all it's Branches:* And alledges for this *Eph: 1: v: 4: And ſays,* That *Johan: Crocius,* thus expounds theſe Words in his Comment *on that Epiſtle,* and *the Helvetick Confeſs: Cap: 10: §. 2:* and *Markii Medula.* 6thly: He ſays, *pag: 91.* He doth not affirm, *That CHRIST's Merit is the Cauſe of Election,* (which he ſays is commonly underſtood of it's being the Meritorious Cauſe) but affirms, *That Reſpect unto CHRIST's Merit, meaning the glorifying thereof is the Cauſe, namely the final Cauſe, why any are elected, tho' not the Cauſe why this Man is elected rather than another.* He ſays, *The Glory of his infinite Merit is a Part of the final Cauſe of Election.*

So the Order that to him ſeems beſt, is, *That GOD firſt appoints to the Elect, all the Grace, by which they are made meet for the Inheritance of the Saints in Light.* 2dly. *That next, he appoints unto them, the Poſſeſſion of Eternal Glory, becauſe that Act of GOD's Sovereign Free Grace, muſt be exerciſed in a Suitableneſs to his Infinite Righteouſneſs and Holineſs, which cannot allow Sinners (whoſe Sins are not purged) to dwell with him.* And therefore ſays, *If we conceive GOD to appoint to Elect Sinners, all that Grace in Chriſt, whereby their Sins are entirely purged, both as to their Guilt, Filth, and in-Being; And that being conſidered as thus qualified, he appoints them to the Poſſeſſion of Glory, that then this Act will be Exerciſed in a Suitableneſs to Righteouſneſs and Holineſs, which* (he ſays, Pag: 93.) *does not appear it would be, if*

we

we consider them first, as appointed to the Possession of Glory, while only considered as Miserable Sinners.

And further says, Pag: 94. *This is no* Arminian *Error,* 1st: *Because they deny an Eternal and Unchangeable Decree, appointing a particular Number of Persons, either to Grace or Glory.* 2dly. *Because as to particular Persons, they allow only an incompleat, not peremptory Election, upon their foreseen Faith, and which depended upon the right Exercise of their own Free Will, and are not Determined by any Eternal and Unchangeable Decree:* And Alledges his Doctrine on this Subject, is the same with our Doctrine, *Confession of Faith, Chap.* 3. §. 5, & 6.

In general we conceive he does not deliver himself so distinctly upon this head, as were to be wished; as I think is very plain. 2*dly.* The first Proposition denyed, seems to be the same with what he owns after; For does he not say, that the object of the Decree is considered, as duly prepared by the Exercise of the other Attributes of GOD, which require a pre-existent or qualified Object? And does he not say, That GOD appoints unto the Elect, all that Grace whereby their sins are entirely purged, and that being considered as thus qualified, he appoints to the Possession of Glory, if this be not the same with the first Propositions, he denies any indifferent Person may judge, as also his Second Propositions which he refuseth, which is the same upon the Matter, with the first Proposition.

And so is the Third Proposition, he denies the same with what he owns afterward, for what difference is there betwixt this Proposition, which he disowns: Namely, that GOD decrees to give Regenerating Grace to most People, upon his foresight

ſight of their uſing the means aright, and his Decreeing, that by his powerful Providence, that ſuch ſhall uſe the means with moral Seriouſneſs, and that, then being conſidered as ſo qualified, he Decrees to convert them.

Also The Fourth Propoſition, he plainly owns, at leaſt as to Election to Glory, for according to himſelf, GOD having decreed to give them Grace, (and Faith is a Part of that Grace) he conſiders them as thus qualified, and ſo appoints them to Glory; So that Perſons foreſeen to believe, are the objects of Election to Glory.

More Particularly, *1ſt.* I cannot underſtand to what Purpoſe this Diſtinction of the Divine Attributes is; for he ſeems to Confound the Decree and the Attribute, which is a great blunder in Divinity, he ſhould rather have diſtinguiſhed the Decree, and then he ſhould have ſaid, there are ſome Decrees, that ſuppoſe no objects, or object ſo and ſo qualified, and others that do ſuppoſe objects ſo and ſo qualified: For it's of theſe he is ſpeaking. *2dly.* he ſuppoſeth, That the Elect are conſidered the ſame way, and as cloathed with the ſame Qualities, when the object of the Decree, as when the object of that Attribute, which GOD decreed to exerciſe upon them, which is alſo another blunder, *E. G.* Becauſe GOD commonly gives ſaving Grace to them that ſeek it with moral Seriouſneſs: Therefore a great many conſidered as ſeeking ſaving Grace with moral Seriouſneſs, are the object of the Decree to give them Grace. Is it not from this Topick the Papiſts argue, and would prove the Decree to juſtifie Man from forſeen Faith, be-

cauſe GOD juſtifies none in Time, but who are firſt Believers. 3*dly*. He ſeems to make Election and Reprobation, Acts of Diſtributive Juſtice, becauſe Glorification and Damnation are ſo, which is a third blunder, for all Orthodox Divines maintain againſt *Arminians*, that they are Acts of abſolute Sovereignity, as is very plain from *Rom*: 9. *Chap*.

2. He ſays, That the Attributes to be manifeſted by the Decree of Election, being ſuch as require Objects particularly qualified, by the other Attributes, that require no pre-exiſtent or qualified Object, the Objects are conſidered in the Decree as ſo qualified, *Exampli Gratia*, the Attributes to be manifeſted in the compleat Glorification of the Elect, ſuppoſe that they are regenerated Believers, Perſeverers in Holineſs. 1*ſt*. Now if this be not much the ſame with the firſt and third Propoſition, he denies any may judge at the firſt View, and is the very ſame with what *Limburg* maintains, *Lib*: 2. *Cap*: 1. § 8. his Words are, *Quia in prædeſtinatione DEUS homines conſiderat tanquam Chriſto fideles vel infideles, ita ut ſicut Nulli, benedictio aliqua ſpiritualis niſi propter Chriſtum obtingit, &c. Ita Etiam nemini ſalus aut damnatio deſtinata eſt, niſi quatenus in Chriſto conſideratus eſt, vel fidelis vel infidelis.* And § 10. he ſays, *Perſonæ qui ſunt objectum Electionis ſunt fideles, ac in fide perſeverantes*; And proves it by this Argument, becauſe GOD ſaves none in time, but Believers and Perſeverers, *&c*. So alſo, *Lib*: 2. § 22. Says, *Quando in Tempore una res habet rationem cauſæ, altera rationem effecti, prius illud a DEO decretum cenſeri debet, quod habet rationem Cauſæ.* And this is the very ſame with Mr. *Simſon*'s Doctrine.

3. He ſays, That Chriſt is firſt Conſtituted Medi-

Mediator, e're any is choſen, which is both contrary to the common Judgment of Orthodox Divines on this head. *Turret: Part: 1ma: Lib: 4to Quaſt:* 10. *de Electionis Cauſa,* and *Rutherford's Exam. Arminianiſmi, Pag:* 264. *et Wendelin: Lib:* 1. *Cap:* 3. *Theſ:* 12. *Gomarus Tom:* 1. *Pag:* 430. *Bucan Pag:* 389. And is the way *Arminians* go, ſee *Limburg Liber:* 4. *Cap:* 1*mo:* § 8. ſays he, *fundamentum Decreti Prædeſtinationis eſt Chriſtus,* and alledgeth for it as Mr; *Simſon* does, *Eph* 1. 4. in the cloſe of the ſame Paragraph ſays, *Chriſtus enim antea diſtinatus eſt in Salvatorem antequam hominibus diſtinata eſt ſalus.*

NOR does *Epheſ:* 1. 4. alledged by him prove this, ~~for his~~ Gloſs of it, *viz.* That they are choſen in Chriſt, as the Cauſe why any are choſen; for this is the Gloſs *Arminians* puts upon this Text, to ſupport Chriſt's being the Cauſe of Election; and he knows how *Polemick* Divines anſwer this Place, or expound it: See *Turrett: Part: prima Lib:* 4. *Quaſt:* 10. *page* 388. and *Pool's Annot:* on the Place. Our buſineſs is not to refute this Error, only to take notice, that therein he falls in with *Arminians,* or comes near them, for that hath been oft done by Orthodox Divines.

HE alledges firſt, *Johan: Crocius,* but ſince Mr. *Simſon* owns, that he is of the ſame Judgment with the *Helvet: Confeſſion,* the ſame anſwer will ſerve both.

2. HE alledgeth the *Helvetick Confeſſion Cap:* 10: *Parag:* 20. The Words are, *Ergo non ſine medio, licet non propter ullum meritum noſtrum, ſed in Chriſto et propter Chriſtum nos Elegit DEUS,* &c. The ſtreſs of what he alledgeth is in theſe Words,

Sed

Sed in Christo, et propter Christum nos eleget, &c. But this answers not his Purpose; for if these Words be strictly urged, they will prove not only that Christ is first chosen, but that he is the Meritorious Cause of Election, which he expressly disowns, and which he knows is condemned by all Orthodox Divines; and therefore these words *In Christo et propter Christum nos elegit, &c.* must be understood in a consistency with the first Words of that Paragraph, *Ergo non sine medio*, which plainly shews, That that Paragraph speaks of the Means whereby GOD Executes the Decree of Election, not of the order of Election, or any moving Cause: So that the plain meaning is that we are chosen in and for Christ, as the great Mean and Meritorious Cause of that Salvation, which GOD purposeth to bestow on the Elect: And this is further plain from the *1st. Parag:* of that *10th chap:* where Election is said to be free and of meer Grace; Now if they be chosen for Christ, then is he the moving Cause of Election, but GOD's immanent Acts have no moving Cause without them, which is plain from the Scripture they cite in that first Parag: *2 Tim:* 1. 9. where that Grace is said *to be given us in Christ before the Foundation of the World*, which must needs be understood of Christ as the Meritorious cause of the Grace designed to be given, not of Christ as the moving Cause of the Decree.

NEXT, he cites *Markii Medulla cap:* 7. *Part* 5. Where he says of Christ's Predestination, *Vel potest nostræ præordinari ob dignitatem Christi et gloria ejus, vel illi subordinari, ut medium exequen-*

de nostrâ Electionis. Now this answers not his Purpose; because Christ may be considered, either simply as the Second Person in the God-Head, and so a Design of Glorifying the Son, as also of the other Two Persons of the God-Head, is supposed to the Election of any, or he may be considered as God-Man, and so this is a mean to execute Election; and to manifest the Glory of the Second Person, and this way his Election as Mediator supposeth choosing of the Elect, and this Question is commonly understood of Christ as Mediator, *&c.*

Nor does the Reason he brings *page* 90 prove That the Election of some is subordinate to the Constituting Christ Mediator, *viz.* Because it's a Mean to manifest the Mediatory Glory in all it's Branches, for we are to distinguish betwixt the Manifestation of the Glory, of the Second Person of the Glorious God-Head, and the Way in which it is manifested: Now this is by his taking on Him our Nature, and dying for Sinners, the Design of which plainly supposeth the Election of some to Life; so that the constituting him Mediator, supposeth a Design to save some, and is the Mean whereby the Glory of the Second Person is to be displayed. 2*dly.* Two Means that are subordinate to the same ultimate End may have a mutual Influence upon one another, when yet only one is in order of Nature subordinate to the other, as here the Constituting Christ Mediator is to the Design of saving some, as is plain from *Joh:* 3. 16. *God so loved,* &c. Where love to an Elect World is plainly supposed to the Design of sending a Saviour.

4. He says, That Respect to Christ's Merits is the Cause why any are Elected, tho' not the cause why this Man is Elected rather than another; by which he says, he means not that Christ's Merits are the meritorious cause of Election; but only that they are the final cause of Election, i. e. the Glory of his infinite Merit is a Part of the final cause: Now this Doctrine I do not so well understand; for Christ's Merits are either the Meritorious cause why any are Elected; but he expressly denys this, or the moving Cause, and if so it's either of the Salvation decreed, or of the Act decreeing: The first is not to the Purpose, for that no Body denys, and it's not of that, but of the Decree he is speaking, if the second, then GOD's immanent and Internal Acts, have a moving cause without them, which is to make God to have *potentiam passivam*, and is but gross Divinity, and inconsistent with his infinite Perfections. Or *3dly*. It's understood of their being the final cause; and if so, either the meaning is that Respect to Christ's Merits influenceth the Electing Act or Decree it self, which I think must be his meaning; for he does not here express himself so distinctly as were to be wished; and if so, this falleth in with their being the moving cause, why any are elected and is but course Divinity; or else the meaning is that GOD's Design in Election is the manifestation of the Glory of Christ's Merits; and if so, then *1st*. The actual Salvation of the Elect is the End of Election also, 2 *Thes.* 2. 13. and so may be called the final cause of Election; but I had thought, he owned Christ's Merits to be the cause of Election, in a sense

peculiar, and not common to the actual Salvation of the Elect. 2*dly*. It ſeems to be a ſtrange way of ſpeaking, to make the Manifeſtation of the Glory of that, which is but a Mean of glorifying the Freedom and Riches of GOD's Grace the End of Election, for we find that the End of Election is the glorifying of the Divine Perfections, not of a Thing or meer Mean, ſee *Epheſ.* 1. 6. Now Chriſt's Merits are the great Mean of the Execution of the Decree of Election. How then, the manifeſtation of their Glory is the End of Election, I do not ſo well perceive. 3*dly*. It would ſeem this Way, That Election of the Elect, conſidered in it ſelf, is not ſo free an Act of Grace, as the Election of one, compared with another, who is paſſed by; for he ſays, That reſpect to Chriſt's Merits is the cauſe why any is choſen, but not ſo, when one Elect Perſon is conſidered with relation to another, that is paſſed by, which plainly ſhews it muſt be underſtood of a moving cauſe; for if it be applyed to *his* final cauſe, *viz.* That the manifeſtation of the Glory of Chriſt's Merits, is the final cauſe why any is choſen at all; but not the final cauſe, why this Man is choſen rather than another, it is hardly good Senſe, and is falſe; for is not the manifeſtation of the Glory of Chriſt's Merits, the End alſo why this Man is choſen rather than another? Though I muſt own, it's a new and harſh Way of ſpeaking to ſay, That the glorifying of Chriſt's Merits is the final cauſe why any are elected, and that Chriſt's Death is the cauſe why any are elected; but not why this Man is elected more than another; and ſeems to carry the *Sibboleth* of Ar-

Arminian Doctrine in it's Head, or to imply ſomething that Mr. *Simſon* hath not thought fit more fully to expreſs, ſure he does not keep *to a Form of ſound Words.*

5. ACCORDING to this Order, that ſeems beſt to him, it follows, That GOD conſiders many of them he elects or decrees to convert, as uſing the outward Means with Moral Seriouſneſs (and according to him it's in Mens Power to be Morally ſerious) and being ſo conſidered, Decrees to convert them. *2dly.* According to this Schem of his, in the Decree of Juſtification Men are conſidered as Believers; and being thus conſidered, he decrees to juſtifie them, and ſo in the Decree of Glorification, they are conſidered as Perſeverers. So that it would ſeem, that their foreſeen Faith, hath the like Influence in the Decree to juſtifie them, that being actually exiſting, it hath upon their Juſtification; this to me ſeems to be of a Kin with *Election to Juſtification from foreſeen Faith.*

HIS Reaſon for this ſeems weak, *viz.* Becauſe they cannot be glorified, till they firſt be ſanctified: For *1ſt.* This way *Papiſts* and *Arminians*, would prove Election from foreſeen Faith and good Works, as every *Theologue* knows. *2dly.* It ſuppoſeth that the Decree is an act of Juſtice, which is likewiſe *Arminian* Doctrine, and a Soleciſm in Divinity, for all Orthodox Divines own, That Election and Reprobation are acts of abſolute Sovereignity, as is plain from *Rom: 9.* *3dly.* If the Deſign of their Sanctification be their Glorification, then the Deſign to glorifie them is ſuppoſed to be the Deſign to ſanctifie them, and

there-

therefore in the Decree of Glorification, they are not conſidered as ſanctified.

6. He ſays, *He differs vaſtly from* Arminians *on this Head, &c:* But though it be true, he owns Election to be the Fountain of all Grace, and that Mens believing and perſevering, is the Fruits of the Decree, *&c.* Whereas *Arminians* ſuſpend Mens believing, upon the Uſe of their Free-will, and improving of common Grace, which they may accept or reject, as they pleaſe; yet he differs not from them ſo very far; for his Schem of Election is very much the ſame, with that which *Limburg* lays down, *Lib: 4to Cap. 1mo. Par.* 8 & 10. See *Turrett: part: 1ma. Lib: 4to. Quaſt: 10ma. pag:* 386. For they ſay, Chriſt is firſt choſen, before the Elect: So ſays Profeſſor *Simſon.* 2*dly.* They make Chriſt the Foundation and Cauſe of Election in general; or they ſay, That Election is made with a View to Chriſt's Death, either as the meritorious or moving Cauſe; ſo he affirms alſo. Indeed he diſowns Chriſt's Death to be the meritorious Cauſe; yet he affirms, That Reſpect to his Sufferings, is the Cauſe of Election; which we hinted, can hardly in any good Senſe, be underſtood otherwiſe. 3*dly.* They deny Chriſt's Death to be the Cauſe, why this Man is choſen, rather than another: So he alſo does. And 4*thly.* They make Men conſidered as believing and perſevering, the Object of the Decree of Glorification; ſee *Limburg: Lib: 4to. Cap: 1mo. Par: 10mo.* So does Mr. *Simſon* alſo, and the Reaſon they go upon is the ſame, with what he makes Uſe of, becauſe Men are conſidered in the Decree, when the Objects thereof, as cloathed with the

ſame

ame Circumſtances, wherewith they ſtand veſted, when the Object of the Execution of the Decree, I know he owns a Particular and peremptory Decree, which they deny; but that belongs to a different Queſtion, they agree ſtill as to the Quality under which the Object of Election is conſidered, 5*ly*. They make Election not an Act of abſolute Sovereignity, but of diſtributive Juſtice; ſo does he, though he doth not affirm it in expreſs Words, as is plain from his Diſtinction of GOD's Attributes he gives, *Page* 87 *of his Anſwers*, which we touched upon before, which Diſtinction he applies to the Decrees; for he ſays, Becauſe GOD cannot in Juſtice glorifie a Man, till he perſevere, and be perfectly holy; therefore in the Decree of Glorification he is conſidered as ſuch: *See Page* 93 *of his Anſwer*. 6*thly*, They ſuſpend Faith upon Mens free Will, ſo doth he, for though he confeſſes that it is not in Mens Power to believe, yet he makes it to follow infallibly upon what is in Mens Power, *viz*. upon moral Serioufneſs in the Uſe of Means: So that albeit Men cannot believe without an Almighty Power, yet that matters not much, ſince that upon which Faith is infallibly wrought in them is in their Power; ſo that he ſeems not to be very many Removes from *Arminians* on this Head, for we know that *Arminians* hold every Man to have ſufficient Grace mediatly, ſee *Turret*: *parte prima Quaſt*. 4. §. 1. It's no very great Matter, whether Faith be in my Power or not, if that upon which it is infallibly given be in my Power: In a Word, will any ſay, That a Thing is not an *Arminian* Error, becauſe

the

the Maintainer does not ſtand up, for the whole Schem of *Arminian* Doctrine.

7. THIS Doctrine is not the ſame with that of the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap. 3. Par:* 5, 6. As he alledges, but againſt it; where the Elect are ſaid to be *choſen in CHRIST to everlaſting Glory, out of his meer Grace and Love, without any Foreſight of Faith, good Works, or Perſeverance in them, or any other Creature, as Conditions or Cauſes moving him thereto*; and the *Parag:* following tells us, *That being appointed to Glory, they are appointed alſo to the Means, and ſo are made to believe*, &c. Now if Election be thus free, it can have no moving Cauſe from without, and therefore Reſpect to CHRIST's Merits cannot be the Cauſe of Election, *viz: moving Cauſe*; for if he ſpeaks to the Purpoſe, he muſt underſtand it of a moving Cauſe: For ſo all Divines whether *Orthodox* or *Arminian*, handling that Queſtion concerning the Cauſe of Election, underſtand it never of a *final Cauſe*, but of a *moving Cauſe*: And I never heard it before, That CHRIST's Merits were the final Cauſe of Election; I confeſs it's an odd Way of ſpeaking. 2*dly*. If Election to Glory be without foreſeen Faith, *&c:* Then in Election to Glory, they are not conſidered as Believers and perſevering. 3*dly*. If they be foreordained to the Means leading to Glory, as the End, then they cannot in the Decree of Glorification, be conſidered as firſt veſted with the Means, *viz:* Faith and Holineſs for the End in the Decree, is ſtill ſuppoſed to the Means.

TO conclude this Head, I obſerve, That when he conſiders two Parts of the Decree: *Pag* 88, and

and *Pag.* 89. 1*st*. What relates to the End, 2*dly*. What relates to the *Means* to attain that End; he places the conſtituting of CHRIST Mediator, in the firſt Part, *viz.* the Decree concerning the End; now this I do not underſtand, for though the Manifeſtation of all the glorious divine Perfections diſcoverable by the Work of Redemption, be the End of the Decree, yet how conſtituting CHRIST Mediator, is a Part of this End; I am at a Loſs to take up: For certainly the Manifeſtation of the Glory of the ſecond Perſon in the God-Head, and the appointing CHRIST Mediator, are Things very different: The firſt indeed belongs to the *End*, but the ſecond as plainly to the Means for attaining this End, as is obvious.

2. He frequently ſpeaks of his Opinion (according to his Opinion) which I take to be a Confeſſion that his Opinion differs from our commonly received Doctrine. And

Lastly, he alledges, That Mr. *Webſter* wrongs him, when from theſe Words of Mr. *Simſon*'s Letter *viz.* (*That if we uſe the Means, we ſhall obtain regenerating Grace*) he alledges it follows, That Perſons who are foreſeen to believe, are the Objects of Election, but if it follow not any may judge, ſince according to him, Perſons when the Object of Election are conſidered as cloathed with the ſame Circumſtances in which they are the Object of the Execution of the Decree, and therefore ſince Men in Juſtification are conſidered as Believers, according to him it follows, That they are conſidered as Believers in the Decree to juſtify them: It is true, he owns ſpecial Grace to enable

able them to believe, which *Arminians* deny, yet with *Arminians* he owns, *That moral Seriouſneſs is infallibly followed by ſaving Grace, and that Men have it in their Power, to be morally ſerious:* It is true alſo he ſuſpends *moral Seriouſneſs upon an infallible Decree,* which *Arminians* do not; but yet ſtill the getting of ſaving Grace is by him ſuſpended upon the good Uſe of Mens natural Powers; for the Decree never deſtroys Mens free Will, in the largeſt Extent the Creature is capable of, it did not deſtroy their free Will who crucified the LORD of Glory, and he ſays no more, than he allows in the moſt indifferent Actions of Men, which are as much in their Power as any Thing can be, and yet theſe all are ſuſpended upon an infallible antecedent and particular Decree.

CHAP. III.

His Anſwers to the third Article of the firſt Libel, concerning the Number of the Elect.

FIrſt, He denyes ſeveral Propoſitions as not his. The firſt Propoſitions he diſowns as his is, *That he arraigns all Orthodox Divines, for their bold aſſerting the Number of the Elect to be fewer than that of the Reprobate.*

SECOND Propoſition is, *That he makes Chriſt the univerſal Remedy, provided for* Jews, Mahometans, *and* Pagans; *and that the Covenant of Grace doth extend to them, and include them; which he acknowledges to be the Sentiment of* Arminians,

Apolog.

Apolog: Remonſtrantium, Fol: 86, 87. And gives us the Sentiments of *Arminians* about the Univerſality of the Remedy for Sin, in theſe three Propoſitions; as *firſt, That Chriſt is the univerſal Remedy, by which GOD deſigned to ſave all Mankind, Altho' in the Event, they be not all ſaved.* 2*dly.* They ſay, *That GOD could not in Juſtice condemn Infants, for original Sin.* 3*dly* They ſay, *That Infants are uncapable of Regeneration.* All which he acknowledges to be Errors; and ſays, he yearly refutes them, *pag:* 98. of his Defences. Further he ſays, That this ſecond Propoſition is alſo capable of this ill Senſe, *viz., That Chriſt is the univerſal Remedy for* Jews, *&c. who ſhall be ſaved by him, if they live honeſtly, according to the Rules of their reſpective Religions.* This alſo he confeſſes is a groſs Error.

PROPOSITION third, *So far univerſal is Redemption, and the Covenant of Grace, that none ſhall want the diſtinguiſhing Bleſſings of them, who do not by actual ſinning exclude themſelves.* This Propoſition, he ſays, is not a diſtinct and true Account of his Opinion, which he ſays, he will ſhew in it's own Place.

PROPOSITION fourth, *Puniſhing in Hell for original Sin, cannot be reconciled with the Juſtice and Goodneſs of GOD.*

PROPOSITION fifth, *GOD that he might not be unjuſt, or cruel, for executing the Sanction of the Covenant of Works; he was obliged of Neceſſity to make a Covenant of Grace.*

THESE two Propoſions he does not declare, whether he owns them, or diſowns them; only alledges, That Mr. *Webſter* deals hardly with him, in adducing for a Proof of them to be his, ſome

Paſſag-

Paſsages out of Mr. *Simſon*'s Letter to Mr. *Rowan*, dated *January* 14*th.* 1712. His Reaſon is, *Pag:* 100 of his *Defences*, *Becauſe any Miniſter would think himſelf hardly dealt with, if he had brought againſt him, in Judgment all ſuch things as might be pick'd out of Letters, that have paſſed between him, and ſome Comrade; wherein for clearing of Truth, he propoſes ſuch Objections or Anſwers about Points of Divinity, as occurred to him; which may be different from what is his fixed Opinion.* But this ſeems to be but a Shift and an Excuſe. The Paſſages themſelves he again owns, which we ſhall afterwards conſider.

THIS Propoſition he expreſly owns, *viz. That GOD would not have ſuffered the Propagation of Mankind after the Fall, unleſs a Remedy for Sin, had been provided and propos'd*: And thinks it can be prov'd, *That it could not be otherwiſe in this Caſe*: In which Opinion, he ſays, *He ſtands not alone*: For that End cites Doctor *Owen*, in his 8. *Exercit: on the Hebrews, Vol:* 1. *Par:* 79, 85. *Par:* 23. And *Vol:* 2. *on the Heb: Eexcit:* 5. *Par:* 9. *Pag:* 68.

PROPOSITION ſixth, *That the Covenant of Grace is made with* Jews, Turks *and* Pagans: This as comprehended in the ſecond Propoſition he denies.

PROPOSITION ſeventh, *That the Covenant of Works did not extend to all Mankind*: This alſo he refuſeth.

PROPOSITION eighth, *That purſuant to this univerſal Covenant of Grace, the Children of Infidels may be baptized:* This Propoſition, as here expreſt, he denies; and ſays he will ſhew his Opinion about it afterwards.

THE

THE Propoſitions he owns upon this Subject, are theſe following, Propoſition *1ſt. Many of our Divines do too boldly determine, the Elect to be fewer in Number, than the Reprobate, ſeing the Scripture is ſilent in this Matter.*

NOW if they be too bold in determining the Number of the Elect, to be fewer than the Reprobate; then he certainly arreigns Orthodox Divines, for their bold aſſerting the Elect to be fewer than the Reprobate; which is the firſt Propoſition he refuſed.

AS to the Scriptures adduced by *Markius, viz: Matth:* 20. 16. & 7. 13, 14. He ſays, *They are not to the Purpoſe; becauſe theſe Scriptures ſpeak of thoſe, who are outwardly called by the Goſpel, and are commanded to enter in at the Strait Gate, of whom few are choſen: Therefore ſays, It can only be underſtood of Adult Perſons, to whom the Call of the Goſpel is directed; and therefore is not applicable to Heathens and their Children.*

BUT *1ſt.* We would notice, That this is the common Anſwer, that the *Arminians* give to theſe Scriptures, and the like, when adduced by Proteſtant Divines.

2. THE Argument holds *a fortiori*: For if few of them, outwardly called be ſaved, then the Caſe of them, who live without the Goſpel is hopeleſs, *Eph:* 2. 12. For there is no believing, and ſo no Salvation without the Word, *Rom:* 10. 13, 14. which Heathens want. And the Condition of the Children of Heathens can be no better, than that of their Parents. *3dly.* Whom GOD elects, to them he decrees to give the Means of Salvation; but very few of Mankind enjoy theſe

Means

Means: See *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap: 3. Parag: 6.* 4*thly.* Are not the Elect called, *A Remnant, a little Flock, one of a Tribe, two of a Family;* in regard of the reſt of Mankind: Now to reſtrain theſe Scriptures only to Adult Chriſtians (tho' they immediatly reſpect ſuch) is harſh and contrar to the Strain of Orthodox Divines; for if the Covenant and Promiſes thereof in Scripture, extend not only to Adult Chriſtians; but to their Children, then it is plain, the foreſaid Scriptures extend, not only to Adult Chriſtians, but to their Children.

HE labours to confirm his former Anſwer from, *Luk:* 13: 23, 24. From our LORD's waving that curious Queſtion, *Are there few that ſhall be ſaved?* and exhorting People, rather to make ſure their own Salvation, by ſtriving to enter in at the Strait Gate: And for this End cites a Teſtimony out of the *Helvetick Confeſſion Cap:* 10: *pag:* 4: *in Fine, Et cum rogaretur Dominus, An pauci ſint qui ſalventur? Non reſpondit Dominus, ac dicit, Paucos aut plures fore ſalvandos aut perdendos; ſed hortatur potius, ut quiſque contendat ingredi per Portam arctam; quaſi dixiſſet, Veſtrum non eſt, de his curioſius inquirere; ſed magis anniti per rectam Viam Cœlum ingrediamini:* And ſays, That he would not have declared it, as moſt probable, That more are ſaved than damned, were it not, that he found ſeveral of our Divines determining the contrary, *viz.* That fewer are ſaved, which according to him, lays our Doctrine open to the Objections of Adverſaries, which are not very eaſie to be anſwered. But 1*ſt:* It is plain, that neither the foreſaid Scripture, *Luk:* 13: nor that Paſſage cited out of the *Helvetick Confeſſion*, contradict the Propoſition, that

that fewer are ſaved, which we find ſo frequently aſſerted in Scripture, for our Caution and upſtirring: The plain Scop of that Scripture, and ſo of the Teſtimony cited out of the Confeſſion foreſaid, is to diſſwade Men from a curious prying into this Matter, as to particulars, and plainly ſuppoſing, that few are ſaved, to preſs them rather to give Diligence to enter in at the Strait Gate; and ſo ſecure their own Salvation. *2dly.* According to the Scope of his adducing this Scripture, it would ſeem undeterminable, whether fewer or more, even of Adult Perſons, be ſaved, which he himſelf ſeems not to doubt of, ſeing he underſtands the foreſaid Scripture only of Adult Perſons: *3dly:* I want to know what theſe Objections of Adverſaries are, that are not eaſie to be anſwered, againſt this Doctrine, that fewer are ſaved, for I know none, but what are adduced by *Arminians* and *Socinians*: And it's ſtrange, that none of our Orthodox Divines have been able to anſwer their Objections upon this Head.

A Second Propoſition he owns, is, *That he thinks it probable that of the whole Race of Mankind more are Elected and Saved, than Reprobate and Damned.* And as to the Scriptures adduced, *viz. Luke* 12. 32. *Matth:* 20. 16, 22. 14. ſays they can only be underſtood of Adult Perſons, and outwardly called: And as to the currant Expoſition of Divines, ſays he, If that muſt be ſtill followed, alledges this would bring in the *Popiſh* Principle of Interpreting Scriptures, according to the unanimous Conſent of Fathers. And further affirms that he ſcarce finds any of them he had occaſion to conſult, to give this Gloſs of them,

and

and cites *Calvin* as of the ſame Judgment with himſelf in his *Commen:* on *Mat:* 20. 16. 22. 14. alſo *Gomarus* in his *Comm: Mat:* 22. 14. 20. 16.

BUT becauſe this Propoſition depends upon ſome other Propoſitions which he owns; We ſhall firſt take theſe into conſideration, As *Firſt*, That all Baptized Infants dying in Infancy are probably of the Number of the Elect, to whom therefore, before their Death GOD confers the Gracious Bleſſings of the Covenant ſignified and ſealed in their Baptiſm, which according to him, is moſt agreeable to the gracious Nature of GOD, and the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace, and according to him, nothing ſhews that any of them are Reprobate, and that his Opinion in this is not ſingular, adduces *Walæi: Loc: Comm: de effectibus primi peccati*, and *Pictet: Chriſtian: Theol:* Publiſhed in *French*, *Lib:* 13. *cap:* 17. But *Firſt*, this ſeems to be the ſame with the third Propoſition *page* 99. of *his Anſwers*; For if all Baptized Infants dying in Infancy are ſaved, and much more, if all Heathen Infants dying in Infancy be probably among the Number of the Elect: Then it ſeems plain, that none are excluded from the diſtinguiſhing Bleſſings of the Covenant; but who by actual ſinning exclude themſelves, which yet he ſaid was not a true and diſtinct account of his Opinion. 2*dly*. It is true, we ſhould judge charitably of Infants in particular. But to ſay of all Baptized Infants dying in Infancy, that they are Elect is a little too bold: For *Firſt*, it is without Scripture, and no poſitive Truth of Divinity ſhould be advanced without

Scrip-

ctipture Proof, and tho' he call it only probable; et it is plain enough he is pretty positive in this Matter. As to *Mat.* 18. 4. it shews that we must e humble like little Children, but says not that ll little Children are of the Kingdom of Heaven: o *Luke* 18. 16. proves as little, the Place says ndeed, That the Kingdom of Heaven is made up f little Children, but no way insinuates that all ittle Children, even circumcised are of that Kingom. 3*dly*. It seems contrary to Scripture, *First*, *Luke* 18. 16. Seems to say far, that all Infants are ot of the Kingdom of Heaven; for when it is aid, *of such is the Kingdom if Heaven*, it seems lain, that some of them only, not all go to make p that Kingdom. 2*dly*. *Esau* and *Ishmael* were mong the Number of the Reprobate. Now altho' they died not in Infancy, it alters not the ase, because Election and Reprobation go before any good or ill such can do, and according to himself, Election and Reprobation are rom Eternity, and *Arminian* Objections are much he same, against the reprobating Infants that ive to Maturity, that they are against the Reproation of Infants dying in Infancy. As is plain o any who understand the *Arminian* Controversie. 3*dly*. Because all are not *Israel* which are of *Israel*, neither because they are *Abraham*'s Seed re they therefore Children, *Rom*: 9. Now if all Baptized Infants, or Children of Christians dying n Infancy be Elect, then they are Children of the romise, because they are of *Israel* and *Abraam*'s Seed; for they are not capable to lay any Obstructions in the Way by actual sinning, which s his own Reasoning elsewhere: But this does

not ſeem ſo well to agree to the Apoſtles arguing in that *Chapter*. 4*thly*. It ſeems plain from *Acts* 2. 38. *The Promiſe is to you, and to your Children*; where it is plain, *Firſt*, That the Promiſe belongs only to them, whom the Lord calls: Now it is plain from the Words that all are not called either externally, or internally. 2*dly*. It is plain that the Promiſe belongs not ſavingly to all, but to them who are internally called. 3*dly*. That not only all Adult Perſons to whom the Offer is made, are not internally called, but alſo all the Children of ſuch are not internally called; for theſe Words (*as many as the Lord our God ſhall call*) relate both to the outward and inward Call, and reſpect not only Parents, but their Children alſo; ſo that the Promiſe being principally founded upon the inward Call: And it being plain, that all outwardly called, are not inwardly called, it is plain it muſt be reſtrictive, in regard of the Children, as well as of the Parents.

4. IT is plain from the Second Command, That GOD threatens to Puniſh the Idolatry of Parents *unto the Third and Fourth Generation*; where we would notice: 1*ſt*. That the Poſterity threatned are not only Adult Perſons, but alſo Infants. 2*dly*. That the Law being Spiritual and Eternal, the Puniſhment threatned muſt include not only Temporal, but Eternal Judgments. 3*dly*. That conſequently the Puniſhment here threatned ſometimes falls upon the Poſterity of Idolaters, whether Adult or Infants: And if upon Infants, tho' otherwiſe they have Original Sin to deſerve it; then all the Infants of Chriſtians dying in Infancy are not Elected. 5*thly*. It is contrary to

o the *Confession of Faith, Chap:* 10: *Parag:* 3. Where we are told, *That Elect Infants dying in fancy are regenerated, and saved by Christ through e Spirit*, &c: To which Mr: *Simson* answers, *hat there is nothing in these Words that determine hether all Infants dying in Infancy are elected, and ved or not, the Expression manifestly abstracting from th*: But this is a plain Evasion and Perverting of he Words: For it is obvious, That the Word, *Elect*) is a Term of distinction, and implies, that l Infants are not elected, even as when the Apo-le speaks of Elect Angels, it implies, that all An-els are not elected, otherways it had been need-ss to say, Elect Infants dying in Infancy are sa-ed. If all Infants dying in Infancy are saved; for o there is no occasion for the distinguishing Term *Elect Infants*. 6*thly*. If all Infants dying in Infancy e saved, it would seem there is no Election, but ith reference to Adult Persons, because Electi-n is properly a taking of some, and a passing by of thers. Now if all Infants dying in Infancy be sa-ed, there is no proper Election of these, even as pon supposition all Mankind were saved, there ould be no proper Election. In a Word from his Principle it follows, That there is no ground or the exercise of Godly Parents about the alvation of their Children dying in Infancy, if hey be all saved, which yet is Matter of deep xercise to them. And it would seem harsh to ay, that their Exercise this way is groundless. esides if all Infants dying in Infancy be saved, the Children of godly Parents dying in Infancy have o Priviledge above the Infants of ungodly Pa-ents. We are far from thinking, that all the In-

fants of Wicked Parents dying in Infancy are Reprobate; yet one would think, That, that Promise made to the Godly, *I'le be their GOD, and the GOD of their Seed*, seems to import something Peculiar, with reference to their Posterity, especially such as die in Infancy.

As to what he says, That this is more agreeable to the gracious Nature of GOD, That all Baptised Infants dying in infancy be saved, its a Fallacious Reason. For, *1st.* Do not *Arminians* found universal Redemption on this Argument? *2dly.* Will not this Argument prove, That there must be more adult Elect Persons, than Reprobate? For this seems more agreeable to the Gracious Nature of GOD. *3dly.* Will it not prove, That poor Heathens living according to the Light they have, are saved, tho' they never heard of a Redeemer? Yea, *4thly.* Will it not prove it probable, That all the Reprobate after sometimes suffering, will either be delivered or annihilated, for both these seem more agreeable to GOD's gracious Nature. As for the Tenor of the Covenant, it suits not with it at all, unless he make the Covenant of Grace universal, as extending to all Mankind, which we find he does afterwards.

As to the Testimonies he cites, as first *Calvin* upon *Matth*: 20. 16. & 22. 14. We grant, he seems to understand these Words, *Many are called, but few are chosen*, of Adult Persons. But first, *Calvin* hath no hint of that Proposition, That of the Race of Mankind, more are elected than reprobated, which is the Proposition Mr. *Simson* affirms. *2dly.* We would notice, That this Proposition *Many are called, &c.* is a general Sentence, such as

there are many in the Gospel, and so is differenly applyed in the meaning of it, according to the Scope of the place and Parable.

And therefore tho' *Calvin* understand the foresaid Sentence, with reference unto the Parables, to which it is annexed, of Adult Persons, it no way contradicts the extending of that Sentence absolutely considered, unto all Elect whether Adult or not, and that all Orthodox Divines generally extend that Sentence to Elect, whether Adult or not, he himself cannot deny; as is plain from the first Proposition he owns, wherein he condemns many of our Divines for their too great Boldness, particularly *Markius*: And besides *Markius*, *Pool's Annotations* so extend the foresaid Proposition: As also Mr. *Henry on the places*, *Mat*: 20. 16. & 22. 14. And *Bucan Pag*: 407. Thus extends the foresaid Scriptures. As also *Math*. 7. 13, 14. And says of the Elect in general, That if their Number be compared with them who are lost, that it is by far the least. And so *Wendelin*: *Comp*: *Pag*: 138. says, *E peccatoribus pauciores ad Vitam Æternam sunt Electi neglecta et præterita majore ipsorum parte*: And for that End adduces the two foresaid Scriptures. Further it is no Argument to restrain the Term *Elect*, to Adult Elect; because Infants are not capable properly of the outward Call; because by the same Reasoning, we would restrain, *Eph*: 1. 4. to Adult Elect, because the Apostle is there speaking to Adult Believers, which I conceive would be too narrow a gloss. 2*dly*. Because Infants are some way called in their Parents, which is plain from their being included within the Covenant, and the Promises belonging to them, as well as to

their

their Parents. 3*dly*. Becauſe tho' Children cannot actively anſwer the outward Call and Means, yet they are paſſively receptive of ſaving Benefits by them, as of Regenerating Grace. 4*thly*. When the Scripture tells us, that all Adult Perſons are not elected, it leaves us to gather from the Analogy of Faith, that the ſame diſtinguiſhing and Electing Grace hath place alſo among Infants; as is plain from the inſtance of *Iſaac* and *Jacob*; And I ſuppoſe all Orthodox Divines extend that Argument to all the Elect, whether Adult or dying under Age.

As to *Gomarus* his gloſs on *Mat*: 20. 16. & 22. 14 viz. *That of the many who are effectually called to obtain Glory, few of theſe obtain the higheſt Degree of Glory*: Beſide that it is ſtraitned, and does not anſwer the ſcope. I ſuppoſe that Mr. *Simſon* himſelf would not reſt in it, as anſwering the deſign of the Spirit in that place. 2*dly*. *Gomarius* does not ſay in that place, That the Number of the Elect is more than of the Damned. 3*dly*. *Gomarus* only ſays, That this is the Senſe of the Propoſition in that place, but does not deny, but that conſidered abſolutely, its Senſe may be further extended: As we Remarked upon the Teſtimony cited out of *Calvin*.

As to the 4*th*. Propoſition, which he ſeems to deny, *viz*. That puniſhing in Hell for Original ſin, cannot be reconciled to the Juſtice and Goodneſs of GOD, he alledges Mr. *Webſter* deals not fairly with him, in citing a paſſage out of his Letter to Mr. *Rowan*; but by this it would ſeem, if a Profeſſor teach publickly ſound Doctrine, that he is not to be cenſured, tho' in his private Letters to his Comrade, he maintain dangerous Errors.

This

This was *Arminius* way, who in his publick Leſſons, taught Orthodox Doctrine, while in his own Chamber he Poiſon'd his Scholars. 2*dly*. Whether the Difficulties of *Arminians* againſt the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, preſs the Federal way moſt, or his way, any indifferent Perſon may judge.

NEXT he denies, That he affirms that GOD was obliged of neceſſity to make a Covenant of Grace, that he might not be unjuſt or cruel in executing the Sanction of the Covenant of Works, but affirms theſe two Propoſitions. 1*ſt*. *That GOD would not have ſuffered the Propogation of Mankind after the Fall, unleſs a Remedy for ſin had been Provided and Propoſed.* And cites Doctor *Owen*, as agreeing with himſelf, *Exer*: 8. *Heb: Vol*: 1. *Pag:* 79, 85. *Par*: 13. And, *Vol*: 2. *Heb*: *Exercit*: 5*ta*: *Par*: 9. *Pag:* 68. The Second Propoſition he owns, is in the cloſe of his Letter to Mr. *Rowan*, dated *January* 14*th*: 1712. viz: *Evangelium eſt Promulgatum omni et toto humano generi ubicunque, magis implicite vel explicite, ita ut poſſunt obtinere ſalutem Æternam, ſi velint, uti iſta cognitione debito modo ſi orarent DEUM, obtinerent miſericordiam, licet non eo modo, quo nos eam conſequimur.* Which Propoſition he affirms, when rightly expreſſed, will not admit Mr. *Rowan*'s Conſequences but on the contrary, ſerves to refute theſe Errors, which Propoſition any may ſee to coincide with the Third Propoſition, which he ſays is not a true Account of his Opinion.

AS to the firſt Propoſition he owns, we ſhall firſt conſider the Teſtimonies he adduces; and as to the firſt Teſtimony cited, *viz: To what End ſhall*

we

we conceive the Providence and Patience of GOD to be exerciſed toward the Race of Mankind for ſo long a Seaſon on Earth, &c. But to ſuppoſe, that GOD hath no other deſign at all but meerly for his Patience to forbear them a while in their folly and then to avenge Himſelf upon them, is unſuitable to His Wiſdom and Goodneſs.

BUT 1*ſt*. we would Notice, That this is an Argument drawn from GOD's Patience towards Mankind, to prove that GOD hath not left all Mankind to Periſh under the Curſe; becauſe he has foreborn them ſo long; but this is only a Moral Argument, and does not infallibly prove the thing, abſtract from a Revelation of GOD's Will more than Mr: *Owen*'s firſt Argument, drawn from the Glorious Perfections of GOD: For tho' all Mankind had fallen under the Curſe, GOD could have glorified Himſelf in their Ruine. 2*dly*. Mr. *Owen* ſays in the for-cited place, *That GOD would long ſince have cut off the whole Race, if a Remedy had not been provided*: From which Words it is plain, that he owns that *Adam* would have had Poſterity, tho' a Remedy had not been provided; and ſo he differs from Mr. *Simſon*; only he ſays, *Adam*'s Race had been cut off long ago, if a Remedy had not been provided:

THE 2*d*. Teſtimony out of *Owen*, *Pag*: 85. *Par*: 23. *If there be not a Promiſe of Deliverance expreſſed in theſe Words, whence is it, that the Execution of the Sentence of Death againſt Sin is ſuſpended, &c.* But we would notice, That Mr. *Owen* is proving the Promiſing of a Remedy to be contained in theſe Words, *The Seed of the Woman, &c.* from GOD's ſuſpending the Execution of the Sentence againſt Sin, but this does not infallibly prove, That the Sentence

Sentence would have been immediately executed, even tho' a Remedy for Sin had not been provided, as is plain from the Teſtimony he cites out of *Owen, Vol:* 2. *Exercit:* 5: *Par:* 9: *Pag:* 68. where treating of Vindictive Juſtice, he ſays, that to this belongs the Way, Decree, Time, Seaſon and Manner of Puniſhment; And affirms, That theſe things are not neceſſarly ſtated in the Juſtice of GOD. The Aſſignation and Determination of them belonging unto His Sovereign Will and Wiſdom, *&c:* From which Words it is plain, that tho' Vindictive Juſtice require Sin to be puniſhed, yet the Time, Manner, *&c:* of puniſhing are ſuſpended upon His Free Will and Wiſdom; So that it is plain according to Mr *Owen*, that GOD might have ſuſpended the Puniſhing of *Adam*'s ſin for as long a Seaſon as He in His Infinite Wiſdom would have ſeen fit, even tho' a Remedy had not been deſigned.

WE ſhall 2*dly*, conſider this Propoſition in it ſelf, *Pag:* 82. of his Anſwers, *viz. That GOD would not have ſuffered the Propogation of Mankind after the Fall, if a Remedy for ſin had not been provided and propoſed, and that it can be proven, that it could not be otherways in that Caſe.* Now, 1*ſt:* This ſeems plainly to ſuppoſe, that the Sentence would have been immediately executed upon *Adam*, if a Remedy had not been provided. But tho' Juſtice require the Puniſhment of Sin; yet the time of inflicting the Puniſhment, depends upon GOD's Free Will and Infinit Wiſdom, as all Divines Acknowledge. And we ſee, from the laſt Teſtimony cited out of Doctor *Owen*, and do we not ſee, that the full Execution of the Sentence againſt the fallen

fallen Angels, is ſuſpended for a while. Scripture tells us, That they are reſerved in Chains until the Judgment of the Great Day. The Caſe of Mankind would have been much the ſame, upon that Suppoſition with that of Heathens, who never knew any thing of the Goſpel. *2dly:* I want to know, whether in that caſe *Adam* could have been the Repreſentative of his Poſterity, if he could not have been the Repreſentative, then neither was he a Repreſentative, even upon Suppoſition a Remedy was provided; For his repreſenting them has no Connection in it ſelf with the Providing, or not providing a Remedy. *2dly.* I would know why he could not have been a Repreſentative, it muſt either be, becauſe the Sentence would have been immediately executed; but this we have juſt now diſproved: And even upon that Suppoſition we conceive, That *Adam*'s Poſterity would have been put in a ſtate of Exiſtence, and ſo ſubjected unto the ſame Puniſhment with *Adam*, and this is no more than what he himſelf acknowledges upon the Matter; for he expreſly denies, That he affirms, that GOD cannot Puniſh meerly for Original Sin: Now if GOD can juſtly puniſh, meerly for Original Sin, there had been no injuſtice in it, if all *Adam*'s Poſterity had been immediately ſubjected unto the ſame Puniſhment with *Adam*, upon Suppoſition, That the Sentence had immediately been executed upon *Adam* himſelf, or it muſt be becauſe the Sentence could not have been juſtly inflicted in caſe a Remedy had not been provided; but this plainly ſays, That *Adam* in that caſe could not have repreſented his Poſterity; And alſo reflects upon GOD's Wiſdom in denouncing

nouncing, a threatning againſt *Adam*, as a Repreſentative of his Poſterity, which he could not juſtly execute, unleſs a Remedy had been provided, which ſeems to be the ſame with the Propoſition he denied, *viz: That GOD, that he might not be unjuſt or cruel, in executing the Sanction of the Covenant of Works, was obliged of Neceſſity to make a Covenant of Grace*: And any Body may ſee, that theſe two Propoſitions hang one upon another. *3dly.* This Propoſition ſuppoſes, that none is condemned meerly for Original Sin, which we ſhall afterwards conſider.

THERE remains two Teſtimonies he cites, That all baptized Infants are ſaved; the firſt is of *Wallæus Loc: Comm: de Effectibus primi Peccati*: Now any who will look into that Place will ſee, how little it makes for his Purpoſe; for it is plain he is ſpeaking of the Children of Believers, and of them he acknowledges, That ſuch as being baptized die in Infancy, are ſaved, as is plain from his Words, *Pag:* 283. *Quod vero ad Liberos Fidelium attinet Quæſtio propriè non eſt de circumciſis et baptizatis, quia de omnibus illis confidendum, ex DEI & Chriſti Promiſſione et Obſignatione facta per Baptiſmum, eos ſervari, ſi in Infantia moriantur.* Now it is plain that he affirms no ſuch thing, as that all baptiſed Infants are ſaved, only that the Children of ſuch, who are Believers, dying in Infancy are ſaved; which falls far ſhort of Mr. *Simſon*'s Propoſition, *viz. That all baptiſed Infants, dying in Infancy are ſaved.* As for *Pictet*, being in *French*, I have not read him: See *Pictet: Lib:* 15. *Cap:* 17.

HIS fourth Propoſition he owns, *Pag:* 112. is, *That we ſhould judge charitably, and hope the beſt of*

the

the Children of Heathens, and other Infidels, who die in Infancy: His Reaſons are, *1ſt. Becauſe it is very agreeable to the Nature of our Gracious GOD, and the Tenor of the Covenant*: But we have formerly touched upon this Reaſon, and conſidered it: It will as well prove the Doctrine of univerſal Redemption; for according to his Way of reaſoning, it is very agreeable to the gracious Nature of GOD, that Chriſt ſhould have died for all Mankind, without Exception. I am ſorry to find Mr. *Simſon* fighting with *Arminian* Weapons.

HIS ſecond Reaſon is, *Becauſe GOD hath no where in Scripture excluded Children of Heathen, dying in Infancy, from the Benefits of Chriſt's Purchaſe.* But this Reaſon is weak; for if Scripture ſpeak nothing this Way of the Infants of Heathens, how comes he to advance ſuch a bold Propoſition, without Scripture Warrant? Sure it is ſafer to deny it, yea, the contrary is pretty plain from Scripture: For are not all Heathens, ſaid to be *without Hope, and Strangers to the Covenants of Promiſe, Eph.* 2. 12. To reſtrain this only to Adult Heathen, I conceive to be a pretty bold Aſſertion; and upon the Matter, a Denial of Original Sin: For can the State of the Infants of Heathen be better than that of their Parents? And we ſee by the Tenor of the external Diſpenſation of the Covenant, that the Promiſe, belongs *firſt* to the Parents, and then to the Children *Acts* 2, 39. *For the Promiſe is to you and to your Children.* And therefore, if the Promiſe belongs not to Heathen Parents; ſo neither to their Children.

HIS third Reaſon is, *Becauſe if GOD ſhould deny his Grace to all ſuch Heathen Infants, or any of them dying in Infancy, he would deal more ſeverly with*

with them, than he did with fallen Angels; which he ſays, *Is a Peice of Severity, nowhere inſinuated in Scripture, that he knows; but rather the contrary: The Scripture declaring, That GOD's tender Mercies are over all his Works; that the Earth is full of his Goodneſs; and that his Mercy reacheth the Heavens*: And ſays, *That this Opinion can bear no worſe Conſtruction, than of an Exceſs of Charity.* But *firſt*, This Argument ſeems to prove, That none can juſtly be condemned for *Adam*'s Sin, or for Original Sin, if it be a Peice of Severity, that all Heathen Infants, or any of them dying in Infancy are not ſaved: Which is the very ſame with the fourth Propoſition he denied to be his, *viz.: That puniſhing in Hell for Original Sin only, cannot be reconciled to the Juſtice and Goodneſs of GOD.* *2dly.* This ſeems to make Chriſt's Death ſo far univerſal, as that he has ſatisfied Juſtice for *Adam*'s Sin; ſo that none are condemned meerly for Original Sin, either imputed or inherent, which is plainly the Doctrine of *Aminians.* *3dly.* Is not this *Limburg*'s Argument againſt the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin to his Poſterity: And indeed, if Mr. *Simſon*'s Argument be ſtrong for his Purpoſe, it is alſo ſtrong for *Limburg*'s: For if it be a Severity above what fallen Angels ſuffered, to ſubject Infants to the Puniſhment of *Adam*'s Sin; it muſt alſo be a Severity to impute his Sin to them: For Angels have no ſin imputed to them, nor ſuffer for any Sin, but their own perſonal Sin; but if there be no unjuſt Severity in imputing *Adam*'s ſin to his Poſterity, there can be none in ſubjecting them to the Puniſhment; unleſs we ſay, That GOD can juſtly impute the Sin of one to another, but cannot without

out Severity inflict the Puniſhment threatned. And in this ſame very Place, he acknowledges, That Infants are guilty, and polluted Sinners, *Pag:* 113. Now is it not as inconſiſtent with GOD's Juſtice, that Infants ſhould have guilty, & polluted Natures by Reaſon of the Sin of another committed long before they were in Being; and ſo before they could conſent to it, as to ſubject them to the Puniſhment of that Sin; we ſee whether his Reaſonings turn.

As for the Scriptures he adduceth, they are nothing at all to his Purpoſe, *viz. His tender Mercies are over all his Works*: For 1*ſt*. All Orthodox Divines expound theſe Scriptures of GOD's general Mercy and Providence; and we know, that this Gloſs is borrowed from *Arminians*. 2*dly*. As for the firſt Scripture, *Pſal:* 145. 9. *His tender Mercies are over all his Works*: I wonder, how he could alledge it, as an Argument to prove the Salvation of all Infants, even Heathen Infants not excepted: For this Scripture will prove, That even adult Heathens are ſanctified and ſaved; for they are a Part of his Works, over which his tender mercies are; yea, it will prove the Salvation of all Mankind, without Exception, as is plain. The Meaning of this Scripture, is plainly, That GOD's tender Mercies extend to the Preſervation of Man and Beaſt, as is plain from *Pſal:* 36. The ſecond Scripture, *Pſal:* 33. 5. is as impertinent an Argument, to prove the Salvation of all Infants without Exception: For if this follow from *the Earth being full of the Goodneſs of the LORD*: It muſt needs alſo prove the Salvation of all Mankind without Exception; whereas that Scripture plainly ſpeaks of GOD's general Mercy. As to

the

the third Scripture, *Pſal.* 57. 10. where it ſaid, *His Mercy reacheth unto the Heavens.* I cannot comprehend, how the Salvation of heathen Infants can be proven from that: For that Scripture points out the Greatneſs of GOD's Mercy *intenſively* conſidered; but ſpeaks nothing directly of its Extent; otherwiſe I ſee not, but it may be adduced as an Argument to prove the Salvation of adult Heathens; yea, and of Divels alſo: For they haunt not only in the Earth, but in the Air and Clouds. Satan is called, *Eph:* 2. *The Prince of the Power of the Air.*

HE adduces *Franciſcus Junius*, as to him, I grant (for I have not the Book by me) that *Walleus* tells us, That it is the Opinion of *Junius* as to Heathen Infants, but it would be conſidered, 1*ſt:* That as ſeveral Orthodox Divines have their *Sphalmata*, ſo Mr: *Simſon* readilyer imbraces theſe, than other ſound and material Points, wherein he runs croſs to them. 2*dly.* This Doctrine of the Salvation of all Heathen Infants dying in Infancy is to be conſidered here, not ſimply in it ſelf, but as it is grafted by Profeſſor *Simſon* upon the Univerſality of the Covenant extending to all Heathens: For he ſays, The Heathen are ſome Way within the Covenant, and that they have an implicite Offer of the Covenant; as alſo is plain from his double Promulgation of the Covenant, firſt to *Adam* and then to *Noah*; which Inſtances do not anſwer his Deſign, unleſs it be to prove, That by Vertue of this Double Promulgation the Heathen be ſome Way under the Covenant of Grace, which alters the Caſe in Hand very much; but I doubt much if *Junius*

nius maintain the Universality of the Covenant of Grace.

I grant it is a great Mystery concerning Infants; but I think there is no Ground to be so charitable in our Judgment this Way: For, 1*st*, The Grounds alledged by him are very weak, and lay a Foundation for very gross Errors, as we have hinted. 2*dly*, Because he builds his following Proposition upon this; which is a very dangerous one: And tho' he says, He thinks it only probable; yet it is plain from his complex Schem, and from the four Propositions, which he owns on the first Article, That he is pretty positive on this Head. And we know that it is the Manner of them who vent new and strange Doctrine to propose them with a seeming Modesty until once they have gathered Strength. 3*dly*. Because *Paul* calls the Children of the Heathen unclean, 1 *Cor*: 7. Even them dying in Infancy; for he speaks of all such Infants without Exception. Now if all such Infants dying in Infancy be saved, and regenerate, they are rather to be called clean and holy than *unclean*. 4*thly*. Because *Paul* describes the State of Heathens and their Children as most forlorn, *Eph*: 2. 12. Now if all their Infants dying in Infancy be saved; the State of such is not only not forlorn, but very good. 5*thly*. Because the Promises belong only to these and their Children, whom GOD calls, *Acts*, 2. 38. But Heathens were never called; and consequently the Promise belongs neither to them nor their Children. If he affirm, That the Heathen have a Call by the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, *&c*. Than the Promises must certainly

y ſome Way belong to them, ſo that they are not ſuch ſtrangers to the *Covenants of Promiſe* as *Paul* affirms, *Eph*: 2. 12. And if this be not to make the Covenant of Grace univerſal, any indifferent Perſon may judge. *6thly.* If all Heathen Infants dying in Infancy be regenerated, and ſo ſaved, they muſt certainly be ſo regenerate, by Vertue of ſome external Diſpenſation of the Covenant they are under: This ſeems plain; for all that are regenerate, are regenerate by Vertue of ome external Mean: Therefore are they called Children of the Promiſe; and Baptiſm being a eal of Regeneration, ſuppoſes an external Mean f Regeneration it ſelf. Now if ſuch Infants be xternally in the Covenant, I want to know, ow they come to be ſo; ſince their Heathen Paents are plainly ſaid to be *Strangers to it. Eph:* . 12. For the Promiſe is ſaid to be, *firſt, to the arents, and then* to the Children. If he ſay, hat Heathen Parents are ſome Way within he Covenant, this is to make the Covenant of Grace univerſal; which I would think is a Doctrine both contrar to Scripture and our *Confeſſion of Faith.* *7thly.* This ſeems to put the Infants of Heathens dying in Infancy, on a Level with the Children of Chriſtians, that die in Infancy: For pon this Suppoſition, the Priviledge of Chriſtians nfants that die in Infancy, *viz.* their being exterally within the Covenant and having the Seal hereof applyed to them is of no Uſe to them: or it is the Conveyance of the ſaving Benefits y theſe Means, that ſtampts a Value upon the eans themſelves. Now if all Infants of Heaens dying in Infancy be ſaved; then an exter-

nal Covenant State, and Baptiſm are of little Uſe to the Children of Chriſtians dying in Infancy, ſince they ſhould be as certainly ſaved without them. 8*thly*. Upon this Suppoſition, That all the Heathen Infants dying in Infancy, are ſaved; it will follow plainly, That there are ten Times, or perhaps more Elect and ſav'd without the Church, than within it; which is plainly very groſs and abſurd; For of the One and Thirty Parts into which ſome divide the World, they aſſign but Five Parts to Chriſtians of all Denominations; ſo that the Infants of the Twenty and Six Parts dying in Infancy, muſt triple, or quadruple the Number of Chriſtians both adult and Infants, and yet many more Times, the Elect among Chriſtians, including both Adult and Infants; which ſeems a Doctrine hard to digeſt. 9*thly*. If all ſuch Infants dying in Infancy be regenerate e're they die, then they are made Members of CHRIST's Church e're they die; and if ſo, then 1*ſt*. There are many more Members of the Church without it, than within it; and ſo CHRIST's Church is not confin'd to the Chriſtian World. 2*dly*. I would know what is the Mean of their Regeneration? For Chriſtian Infants are regenerated by Vertue of the Word of the Covenant or Promiſe, which Baptiſm, as a Seal appended ſuppoſes. Now ſince the Word or the Goſpel is not among Heathens, the Infants of ſuch muſt either be regenerated without all external Means, or elſe by the Works of Creation and Providence and Tradition, either of which are groſs enough. For if the firſt, That is without Means; then there are many more re-

regenerate without the Means, than by them. If the ſecond, then many more are regenerate by the Works of Creation and Tradition, than by the Word and ordinary Means. 10*thly*. He acknowledges, That Infants might be juſtly condemn'd for original Sin: For he ſays, The contrary is an Error, which he refutes. Now if it be ſo, ſhould he not have advanced ſome ſolid Reaſon, why he judges, That not only ſome, but all Heathen Infants dying in Infancy are ſaved? And if Charity, and the gracious Nature of GOD incline him to think this, will it not alſo influence him to think it probable, That poor Heathens living according to the Light they have, are ſaved tho' they never come to know any Thing of CHRIST. How dangerous is it for Men to go upon their own carnal Reaſoning in Things of this Nature? 11*thly*. Since he acknowledges, That GOD might juſtly condemn Infants for original Sin, how does he tax the doing of this as a Peice of Severity, not ſo agreeable to the gracious Nature of GOD? Doth the Exerciſe of one Attribute deſtroy another? Were it not according to his Way of reaſoning, very agreeable to the gracious Nature of GOD, That all the Heathens ſhould die in Infancy; for then they would all be ſaved, than by ſparing them, leave them in ſuch a State, wherein they never actually attain Salvation. 12*ly*. This new Doctrine is plainly contrar to the *Confeſſion of Faith*, ſpeaking of elect Infants, which plainly ſays, All Infants are not Elect; as when the Scriptures ſpeaks of elect Angels and of the Faith of GOD's Elect, it plainly implies, That all Angels are not elected, and that all

Men have not Faith. It's alſo clear from the Anſwer to that Queſtion in the Shorter Catechiſm, *Did GOD leave all Mankind to periſh in the Eſtate of Sin and Miſery?* The anſwer to the Queſtion ſays, *1ſt. That GOD elected ſome of his good Pleaſure to eternal Life*; where the Queſtion ſpeaks of the Elect in general whether Adult or Infants; and conſequently, That ſome only of Mankind whether Adult or Infant are elected: For to reſtrain the Expreſſion, *ſome*, to Perſons Adult, and not extend it to Infants; is to do Violence to the Words. *2dly*: The Queſtion ſays, That all theſe that are elected, *are brought into a Covenant of Grace, and ſo into a State of Salvation.* Now if all Heathen Infants dying in Infancy be ſaved, and ſo brought within the Covenant of Grace, then many more are brought into the Covenant of Grace, who are without the Church, and want the ordinary Means, than are brought within that Covenant within the Church, where the ordinary Means of Salvation are enjoyed.

I ſhall add two Teſtimonies: *firſt*, Out of *Calvin's Inſtit: Lib:* 4. *Cap:* 16. *Parag:* 17. *Pag:* 478. *Nos autem reſpondemus, Opus DEI, etiamſi Captui noſtro non ſubjaceat, non tamen eſſe nullum. Porro Infantes qui ſervandi ſunt (ut certe ex ea Ætate omnino aliqui ſervantur) antea a Domino regenerari, minime obſcurum eſt.* Where it's plain, That he thinks, that only ſome, not all Infants are ſaved. A ſecond Teſtimony is, *Lib:* 4. *Inſtit: Calv: Cap:* 1. *de Eccleſia, Parag:* 1. where ſpeaking of the true Members of the Church, he ſays, *Quia exiguus Numerus, et contemptibilis, latet ſub ingenti Turba, et Grana Tritici pauca junguntur Paleæ Congeriei, ſolí*

DEO

DEO permittenda est Cognitio suæ Ecclesiæ, cujus fundamentum, arcana est illius Electio. Where it is plain, That he calls the true Members of the Church, and so the Elect, a small Number, in Regard of the rest of the World; and consequently according to *Calvin*, the Number of the Saved is far less, than the Number of them that are lost. 2*dly*. He speaks of them that are true Members of the Church; and consequently of Infants, as well as of Adult Persons: For Infants belong to the Church also; and all that are true Members, he calls but a very small Number, in regard of the rest.

ANOTHER Testimony I add, is out of *Walæus Loc: Commun: pag.* 282. where answering that Question; What becomes of Infants that die in Infancy? He answers, First, *That there is a great difference betwixt Infants born within, and without the Covenant, and for that End cites these Scriptures,* Acts 3. 25. 1 Cor: 5. 12. 1 Cor: 7. 14. 2*dly*. He answers Page 283. *Quod ergo ad Liberos Infidelium attinet, quia promissionem non habent, non possumus iis salutem addicere, sed DEI Judicio relinquimus.* And cites for that end 1 *Cor*: 5. 12. *Eph:* 2. 12.

ANOTHER Proposition he owns *page* 115. of his Defences, *That altho' all Mankind be under GOD's Curse, and deserve Wrath*: Yet he thinks it probable, *That none are excluded from the Benefits of the Remedy for Sin, provided by GOD, and published twice to the World, except such as by their actual sin exclude themselves, and slight or reject, either the clearer Light of the Gospel revealed to the Church, or that obscure Discovery, and Offer of Grace made*

made to all without the Church: According to what he ſaid on the firſt Article.

UPON this Propoſition, we offer, theſe following Conſiderations; *1ſt.* Any may judge what difference there is betwixt this and the third Propoſition, *page* 99. which he ſays, is not a true Account of his Opinion, *Viz. So far univerſal is Redemption and the Covenant of Grace, that none want the diſtinguiſhing Bleſſings of them, who do not by actual ſinning exclude themſelves:* Any may ſee that this is the ſame with the Propoſition he owns here. *2dly.* He ſays, *He knows nothing from Scripture, or Reaſon, that GOD will exclude any from the Benefits of the Covenant, who do not by actual Sinning exclude themſelves*: But can this be a ſufficient Reaſon, becauſe his Propoſition is not expreſly condemned in Scripture; for if it be a weak Reaſon to build the bringing in any ſignificant Ceremonies into the Worſhip of GOD, becauſe they are not expreſly forbidden in the Word; muſt it not be a weak Foundation, upon which he builds ſuch a momentuous Doctrinal Point, as this: Becauſe not expreſly condemned in the Scriptures; if he mean, that it can be proven by good Conſequence from the Word, he would have done well to have hinted at ſome ſuch Argument: Hath not Chriſt enjoined Miniſters to teach nothing but what he hath commanded them, *Mat.* 28. And therefore Miniſters tranſgreſs the limits of their Commiſſion, when they teach any Thing that he hath not commanded; and ſince this Propoſition leans upon the firſt Article, as he himſelf owns, he muſt certainly maintain it not only as probable, but as ſure. *3dly.* He alledges, That

it

it is not contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap: 7. par: 5, 6. 1ſt.* Becauſe GOD may beſtow the Bleſſings of the Covenant on ſuch as are uncapable of External Inſtruction, whether within or without the Church: But does that prove, That all Infants without the Church are ſaved, becauſe GOD may, if he pleaſe, ſave them, will it not prove alſo, that it is probable GOD reveals Chriſt to Heathens, that live according to the Light they have; becauſe if he pleaſe, he can reveal Chriſt to them. *2dly.* He ſays, *It follows not from that* Chap: of the Confeſſion of Faith, *That GOD hath not given by the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, ſome obſcure hints to all Men without the Church that he is reconcilable; Or will it follow, that he cannot, or will not exerciſe ſo much Clemency, towards theſe without the Church, as to exclude none of them from Acceſs to his Mercy, except theſe who tranſgreſs his Law, and ſlight or reject this faint diſcovery of his Grace:* But can there be any Thing clearer from theſe two *Paragraphs* of that *ſeventh Chap: of the Confeſſion of Faith,* That there are only two Diſpenſations of the Covenant of Grace, *Viz:* under the Law, and the Goſpel. *2dly.* Is it not as plain, that there is no Diſcovery, nor Offer of GOD's Grace; but by Vertue of ſome Diſpenſation of the Covenant? ſo that if the Heathens have ſome faint diſcoveries, and Offers of his Grace, they muſt either be under one, or other of theſe two Diſpenſations mentioned in the *Confeſſion of Faith,* which I ſuppoſe he will not affirm: Or elſe they muſt be under a third and diſtinct Diſpenſation of that Covenant,

which

which is plainly contrary to the foreſaid *Paragraphs of the Confeſſion of Faith.*

4. WE obſerve, That he adduces the Teſtimony of no Orthodox Divine, as of the ſame Judgment with himſelf, as to this Propoſition.

5. IF none are ſecluded from the benefits of the Remedy for Sin, but ſuch as by their actual Sins exclude themſelves, and ſlight, either the clearer Light of the Goſpel, revealed to the Church, or that obſcure diſcovery and Offer of Grace, made to all without the Church: Then we offer theſe following Conſiderations upon this Head, *1ſt.* Then the Heathens muſt needs have a Diſcovery and Offer of Grace, tho' obſcure; otherwiſe they could not be ſaid to reject it: But this is plainly to aſſert univerſal objective Grace, which is a Doctrine, condemned by all the Reformed Churches. For what is univerſal objective Grace elſe, than an offer of Grace either clearer or darker made to all Nations. *2dly.* I would know, what is the Medium whereby this offer is made; It muſt either be the Light of Nature, Works of Creation and Providence, as he himſelf aſſerts *page* 116. *of his Anſwers*, without adding *Tradition*; And if ſo, any indifferent Perſon may perceive the groſneſs of this Error; and it's Contrariety to the Scripture, yea, to the Shorter *Catechiſm*; where Faith is deſcribed a receiving of Chriſt, as he is offered in the Goſpel, which plainly ſays, That Chriſt is offered no where elſe; But if by the Works of Creation and Providence Chriſt be offered, tho' but obſcurely, than the offer and diſcovery of Chriſt is not peculiar to the Word, and if he add Tradition alſo to the Works of Creation and

Pro-

Providence as a conjunct Mean of the diſcovery, and Offer of Grace: Then we anſwer, 1*ſt*. He ſpeaks only of the Works of Creation and Providence, not a Word of Tradition in the foreſaid *page* 116. *of his Anſwers*. 2*dly*. He builds this obſcure diſcovery and offer of Grace made to the Heathens upon a very ſandy Foundation: For how is he ſure, that any Tradition of that kind is not utterly loſt, among many Heathen Nations; but having conſidered, and I hope diſproved this of Tradition upon the firſt Article, I inſiſt not on it.

2. IF the Heathen have an obſcure diſcovery and offer of Grace by the Works of Creation and Providence, *&c*. I ſee not what hinders them from being means of applying that Grace; For where there is an Offer of Grace, made by an external *Medium*, with a Promiſe of conferring the Grace offered, upon the right uſe of that Medium, I ſee not what hinders that *Medium* from being denominate a mean of Grace, more than the preached Word; but here according to Mr. *Simſon*, is an External Mean diſcovering and offering Grace, tho' obſcurely, and alſo a Promiſe: For he ſays, None ſhall want the diſtinguiſhing Benefits of the Remedy for ſin, except ſuch who by actual ſinning ſlight, either the clearer Light of the Goſpel revealed in the Church, or that obſcure offer of Grace made to all without the Church, which plainly implies a Promiſe, tho' obſcure of the Benefits of the Covenant, if they improve, theſe faint and obſcure offers of Grace, made to the Heathen by the Works of Creation, *&c*. For if their be not a Promiſe here implyed, how can Mr. *Simſon* according to *his own Principles*, juſtifie

ſie GOD's puniſhing of the Heathen for ſlighting theſe obſcure Offers of Grace? Now if Heathens have ſuch Means whereby there is an obſcure offer of Grace, and a Promiſe, tho' not ſo clear: I ſee not what ſhould hinder them from being Means of the actual Application of that Grace, unleſs we ſay, that GOD has annexed a Promiſe to certain Means that offer Grace, which never are made effectual for the Application of that Grace to any who enjoy theſe Means; how this conſiſts with GOD's Wiſdom, any may judge: For would it not reflect upon the Wiſdom of GOD, if the ordinary Means of the Word, were never made effectual to any who did enjoy them.

3. I want to know, what it is the Heathens have the offer of; it muſt either be Reconciliableneſs; but that cannot be: Becauſe Reconciliableneſs is not properly capable of being offered; for whether Heathens accept or not, GOD ſtill reveals himſelf reconcilable, and is ſtill reconcilable according to Mr. *Simſon*: Or it muſt be the particular Benefits of the Remedy for ſin, as is plain from his own Words: For he ſays, none are excluded from the Benefits of the Remedy for Sin, except ſuch who by actual ſin ſlight and reject, either the clearer Light, *&c.* Now, if they be not to be excluded, from theſe Benefits, but upon the Suppoſition of their ſlighting the obſcure offer; made to all without the Church; this plainly ſuppoſes, that they have the offer of theſe Benefits; And if ſo, then the Heathen, have not only a diſcovery of GOD's reconcilableneſs, but alſo an obſcure Offer of a Saviour, of an imputed Righteouſneſs, Par-

don of Sin, *&c.* For all these are Benefits of the Remedy for Sin. But if this sound not very harsh, to say, That the Heathens have an Offer of the particular Benefits of Redemption, tho' more obscure, we leave it to any indifferent Person to judge.

4. IF the Heathen have an Offer of the Benefits of the Remedy for Sin, and so a Promise; (for the Offer of Grace necessarly implies a Promise) then they are not such Strangers to the Promises of the Gospel, as *Paul* would seem to make Heathens, *Eph:* 2, 12. For they that have a Discovery and Offer of the Promises, tho' more obscurely, cannot be said to be altogether Strangers to the Promises. Yea, further, Heathens are some Way within the Covenant of Grace. For what else denominates a Man to be under the Covenant of Grace? But the enjoying of the Means whereby the Grace of that Covenant is offered, either more clearly or more darkly.

5. IF the Heathen have a Discovery and Offer of GOD's Grace, tho' more faintly, they must certainly be under a third Dispensation of the Covenant of Grace; for what makes a different Dispensation of the Covenant, but a Diversity of the external *Mediums* revealing and offering the Grace of that Covenant. Now according to Mr. *Simson*, The Heathen have a faint and obscure Offer of the Grace of the Covenant by an external *Medium*, distinct both from the Law under the Old Testament, and the preached Gospel under the new, *viz.* by the Works of Creation and Providence; which is an external Mean of revealing GOD's Grace, distinct both from the Law and the Gospel

ſpel; and therefore they muſt neceſſarly be under, a third and diſtinct Diſpenſation of the Covenant of Grace.

6. I deſire to know, if the Heathens can rightly improve that faint Diſcovery, and Offer of Grace by the Works of Creation and Providence, *&c.* If they cannot, then what Advantage have the Heathen by ſuch a Diſcovery and Offer of Grace? and how will he according to his own Scheme, juſtify GOD's Procedure in condemning the Heathen for not improving an Offer of his Grace, the Improvement of which was never in their Power? If he ſay, That it is in their Power, to improve that dark Offer of Grace, then it deſerves to be conſidered, 1*ſt*, If this be not a very great Elevation, and exalting the Power of Man's free Will? for ſo it's in Heathens Power to obtain the Benefits of the Remedy for Sin, when ever they will: For it's in their Power to improve that dark Offer of Grace they have (for this he muſt maintain according to his Scheme) and upon their ſo improving that dark Offer; they ſhall not be excluded from the Benefits of the Remedy GOD has provided for Sin. 2*dly*. It deſerves to be conſidered, If this do not make the Condition of Heathens, not only, not to be without Hope, contrar to what *Paul* ſays, *Eph:* 2. 12. But alſo, if it do not make their Condition little inferior to that of profeſſing Chriſtians? For, the Condition of them who enjoy an Offer of Grace, tho' more dark, and in whoſe Power it is to improve the ſaid Offer (and who upon the ſaid Improvement, ſhall not be excluded from the Benefites of the Remedy for

for Sin) ſeems not to be ſo very hopleſs and forlorn. 3*dly*. This ſeems to put the Heathens under no much greater Incapacity to obtain Salvation, than *Adam* was in to obtain Life in the State of Innocency: For as *Adam* had a Power to keep the Law, upon which he would have infallibly obtained Life; ſo according to Mr. *Simſon*, it's in the Power of Heathens to improve the dark Offer of Grace they enjoy, and upon ſo doing, they ſhall certainly obtain the Benefits of the Remedy for Sin. 4*thly*. If it be in the Power of Heathens to improve that dark Diſcovery and Offer of Grace, it is ſtrange that among ſo many Millions of them, never ſo much as one of them did ſo improve that Offer of Grace: when yet we find the great Improvement many of them have made of the Works of Creation and Providence, in the Search after, and Diſcovery of natural Cauſes and *Phænomena*'s of Nature: For how is the Strength of Mens Power known, but by it's Actings.

HE ſays, *Pag:* 116. That he grants it's an *Arminian* Propoſition to ſay, *That GOD cannot juſtly condemn a Perſon meerly for original Sin*, but denies it to be an *Arminian* Error to ſay, *It's probable GOD will not caſt any into Hell, meerly for original Sin, who is guilty of no actual Sin*: And ſays, *He doth not find this Propoſition among the Errors rejected by the Synod of* Dort.

UPON this Propoſition, We offer theſe Conſiderations, 1*ſt*. This ſeems to be only a ſmoothing of that *Arminian* Error. For, 2*dly*. It's plain from his Reaſonings on this Head: *And his new Mould of Doctrine*, That he thinks this more than

then probable; conſidering how it is linked with other Propoſitions maintain'd by him. 3*dly*. It's ſmoother than what *Arminians* maintain; yet the Reaſons advanced by him, go pretty near to prove the Injuſtice of the Thing, as do the Reaſons advanced by *Arminians* on this Head. 4*thly*. Since he ackowledges, it's no Injuſtice to condemn meerly for Original Sin, he would have done well to given ſome ſolid Reaſons for his advancing a Point of this Nature, and of ſuch vaſt Conſequence. 5*thly*. The two former Propoſitions maintain'd by him, are built upon this Propoſition, and ſtand and fall with it; and the Reaſons advanced againſt theſe two Propoſitions do equally militate againſt this; ſo that upon the falling of the two former Propoſitions, this falls with them.

6. SINCE Original Sin, is by all ſound Divines own'd to be a much greater Sin, than any other Actual Sin; it ſeems ſtrange, That GOD ſhould condemn for actual Sins, and not even meerly for Original Sin, which is both the Fountain of actual Sin, and of a far deeper Dy, than any actual Sin.

7. IT would ſeem to follow from this Propoſition; either, That Chriſt by his Death, has ſo far ſatisfied for every Man whatſoever, that none are condemned, either for *Adam*'s Sin, or for original inherent Sin: Which is plainly an *Arminian* Error, and a making Chriſt's Death ſo far univerſal, that he hath thereby procured, that none ſhall be condemned meerly for original Sin; whether imputed or inherent: Sure it looks like it, and leads to it; for according to him, Adult

Sinners

Sinners would not be condemned for Original Sin, were it not for their Actual Sins: Or, it follows, That Chriſt hath not only died for all the Sins of adult Elect; but alſo for all Infants dying in Infancy, whether Chriſtian or Heathen: But beſide what we have formerly ſaid, for the diſproving of that Propoſition; it follows plainly, That Chriſt has vaſtly more Sheep without the Church, for whom he hath laid down his Life, than he hath within the Church; which is plainly a very harſh Propoſition.

8. ADULT Perſons, that are damned, are either damned meerly for actual Sin; but, this is plainly to make Chriſt's Death, ſo far univerſal, that he has ſatisfied Juſtice upon the Account of Original Sin, for every Man; and if ſo, this is plainly *Arminian* Doctrine, and either deſtroys Chriſt's Subſtitution for Sinners; or elſe makes him to have died two Ways, *1ſt.* For all Men, as to Original ſin. *2dly.* More ſpecially as to the Elect, for all their ſins, whether original or actual.

OR *2dly.* They are damned for Original Sin, tho' not only; and if ſo, then his own Argument, in Part recurs upon himſelf: For according to his Way of arguing, does not GOD ſeem to deal more ſeverly with ſuch, than with fallen Angels, in condemning them, for a Sin they could have no Hand in, or conſent to, and which was the Source of all their other actual Sins; whereas fallen Angels, are not condemned, but for their own perſonal Sins.

9. THIS Propoſition is plainly aſſerted, not only without Scripture, but contrary to Scripture; which

which repreſents the Caſe of Heathen, and their Children without Diſtinction, as moſt hopeleſs, and as without the Promiſes, *Eph.* 2. 12, 17. And ſince the Scripture repreſents the State of the Infants, equally hopeleſs with that of their Parents, he needed to have built a Propoſition of this Moment, upon a more ſolid Foundation, than a meer Probability.

10. As to what he alledges from the Synod of *Dort*, we anſwer, That this Propoſition was not under the Conſideration of that Synod, only whether it was conſiſtent with Juſtice, to condemn meerly for original Sin.

ANOTHER Propoſition he owns, *pag.* 117. is, *That the Remedy for Sin, and the Way of Salvation was publiſhed twice to the whole World*: 1ſt. *In* Adam's *Time, immediatly after the Fall, and then in* Noah's *Time, at and after the Flood; and the Knowledge and Obſervance of this only Way of Salvation, ſhould have been tranſmitted through all Ages, and Nations by* Noah's *Poſterity; and it is the Fault of Mankind, that this moſt valuable and neceſſary Peice of Knowledge, hath been ſlighted, and ſo far loſt to the World, as to leave but a few dark Remains of it, in all theſe Places of the World, where GOD hath not thought fit to publiſh it afreſh*: And he grants this to be an *Arminian* Propoſition; but ſays, *That it is never the leſs true.*

BUT here by his own Confeſſion, he plainly ſymbolizes with the *Arminians* in ſo far; and ſo differs from all Orthodox Divines. *2dly.* Tho' it be certain, That the Goſpel was then publiſhed, at theſe two Seaſons to all Mankind, then exiſting, yet it is certain, there is more deſigned in this Propoſi-

poſition, as advanced by *Arminians* and himſelf, than that ſimple Truth: For it is laid down by them as a Foundation, upon which they build the Univerſality of the Covenant of Grace; by Vertue of which Publication, they maintain that all are ſome way within the Covenant of Grace. 3*dly*. I want to know his Deſign, in advancing this Propoſition; for either, notwithſtanding of this double Publication, Heathens remain without the Covenant, and any faint Diſcoveries of GOD's Grace, which I think he will not affirm; for he makes in his fifth Propoſition, *Pag*: 115. That double Publication, the Foundation of theſe dark Diſcoveries the Heathens do enjoy. Or, they are ſome way under the Covenant, by Vertue of this double Publication; and if ſo, beſide the Univerſality of the Covenant of Grace, a Doctrine condemned by all the Reformed Churches, which he thereby maintains. *Firſt*, We remark, That this is the very ſame with the ſecond Branch of the ſecond Propoſition, *Pag*: 98. charged on him by Mr. *Webſter*, which he acknowledges is the Sentiment of *Arminians*, *viz*: That the Covenant of Grace extends to *Jews*, *Pagans Mahometans*, and includes them. 2*dly*. Hereby he intirely founds theſe dark Diſcoveries Heathens have, on Tradition, *i*: *e*. the handing down of that Publication from Father to Son; and not on the Light of Nature, Works of Creation, *&c*. For he ſays in his Propoſition, That this double Publication, ſhould have been handed down by *Noah*'s Poſterity to all Ages.

3. I would know, whether the Goſpel was publiſhed to *Adam* and *Noah*, as publick and Re-

preſentative Heads of their reſpective Poſterities; or only as ſimple natural Parents, bound by Vertue of that Revelation, to hand down theſe Truths to their Poſterity: I ſuppoſe he will not affirm the *firſt*, ſeing he denies *Adam* to have been a Federal Head in the Covenant of Works; and beſide, the Imputation of *Adam*'s and *Noah*'s Faith to their reſpective Poſterity; and ſo the Salvation of all Mankind would infallibly follow: If the ſecond, *i. e.* that double Publication was made to them, as ſimple natural Parents, *&c.* I would know, how he is ſure, that any Tradition of this Kind is not loſt among many *Pagan* Nations long ago; for it is certain, that many Truths of far leſs Moment, are loſt among Heathen Nations, nor did ever any Traveller obſerve any thing of the Goſpel among wild *Indians*; tho' ſome Travellers have narrated ſome dark Hints of the Deluge; yet never did they report any thing of Doctrinal Tradition among them. Again, ſince it is poſſible, and he cannot deny the Poſſibility of it, that doctrinal Tradition hath been intirely loſt for many Ages. I would know, *firſt*, If it be the Sin of ſuch Heathens, that they want the dark Remains of that double Publication, to whom they have been loſt by the Negligence of their Anceſtors, many Ages before. *2dly.* I would know, if ſuch Heathens among, whom Tradition is intirely loſt, have any faint Offers of Grace, if they have not, then ſuch cannot be puniſhed, for the ſlighting of the Offers of that they have not; beſides, that this contradicts, what he expreſly owns in this Propoſition, That all Heathens have the dark Diſcoveries, and Offers of GOD's Grace

they have an Offer of GOD's Grace, then it uſt be intirely by the Works of Creation and rovidence, without Tradition, which beſides 's palpable Groſneſs, is more than he dare affirm; or on the firſt Article, he ſtill joins Tradition.

A Seventh Propoſition he owns, is, *That if n Infant of an Infidel Parent, come lawfully into he Power of a Chriſtian, who is able and willing, or y a lawful Tye is obliged to do the Duty of a Parent, s to its Maintainance and Education, and can bring up in Chriſtianity, and offer to engage ſo to do, in hat caſe he thinks the Infant may be Baptiſed; Seeing, hat altho' he be not a Son by Procreation, yet with re- ect to all that concerns the Infants Maintainance, and hriſtian Education, he is a Son by Adoption; And as on as he is put under the care of a Chriſtian, he be- omes a Member of the Viſible Church, this Providence f GOD, being a probable ſign that he is one of GOD's lect, as much as if he were the natural Son of that hriſtian.*

THIS ſeems to be a new and ſtrange Doctrine, or, 1*ſt.* none ought to be Baptiſed, but ſuch as re within GOD's Covenant, for Baptiſm being Seal, ſuppoſes a Covenant ſtate, but ſuch Chil- ren are not within GOD's Covenant, as is plain rom *Eph.* 2. 12. where Heathens and their Chil- ren are ſaid to be, *Srangers to the Covenants of Pro- iſe.* Now I know but two ways whereby Men an be ſaid to be within GOD's Covenant, *viz.* Externally, 1*ſt.* by their own Profeſſion of the aith, of which ſuch Infants are not capable. dly. By their natural Deſcent from Chriſtian Pa- ents, but this Priviledge ſuch Intants want, to ay that a Chriſtian's engaging for ſuch an Infant,

makes it a Son by Adoption, is weak and looſe; For tho' Men can adopt Infants as to civil Concerns, yet they cannot ſo do, as to making them to be within the Church, as is plain, for this is GOD's Prerogative to preſcribe what makes Men to be within the Covenant: Nor does ſuch an Infants being under the care of a Chriſtian, make it a Member of the Church; For by that Reaſon, Heathen Servants being under the care of a Chriſtian, were to be looked upon as Members of the Church, and to be Baptiſed, even altho' they had made no Profeſſion of their Faith. Again he ſeems to look upon it as probable, that all the Children of Chriſtians are Elect. But, 1*ſt*. I ſtill want Scripture Ground for this. 2*dly*. How is it probable, ſince he acknowledges, that all deſerve wrath by Original Sin; And ſince GOD is juſt as well as Merciful, he needed to have brought ſolid Grounds for aſſerting it probable, that all ſuch Infants are Elect, ſince there are Veſſels of Wrath as well as of Mercy among ſuch, as we ſee in *Iſhmael* and *Eſau*. And, 3*dly*. Do we not ſee, that the greateſt Part of ſuch as live to Age, do give very little Ground to think that they are among the Elect. 4*thly*. It is a pretty looſe mark of Election as to an Heathen Infant it's coming under the care of a Chriſtian, by ſome Accident of Providence; it ſeems according to Mr. *Simſon*, that External Church Membership, is a probable ſign of Election. 2*dly*. They are only to be Baptiſed, to whom the Promiſes belong, as is plain from *Act*. 2. 39. But the Promiſes belong only to Profeſſors and their natural Children; to take in alſo Children by Adoption, is a plain ſtraining

of

of the Words; Beſides that in that caſe, the Children of Chriſtians have no Priviledge this way, above ſuch Adopted Infants which ſounds harſh enough. 3*dly. Children of ſuch are ſaid to be unclean,* 1 *Cor:* 7. How their coming under the care of a Chriſtian makes them clean, and ſo to have a right to Baptiſm, is what I cannot uuderſtand. 4*thly.* The Foundation he goes upon here, makes it yet worſe, *viz.* that all Mankind without exception are ſome way within the Covenant of Grace, and that the Infants of Heathens are ſtill within it, till by their actual Sins they reject the obſcurer Offers of His Grace, by the Works of Creation, *&c:* And this is plain, from what he above ſaid concerning the Goſpel's being twice Publiſhed to all Mankind, which is of no uſe to him at all, unleſs he ſuppoſe that all Mankind, by vertue of that double Publication, have ſome dark offer of, and are ſome way within the Covenant; So that their coming within the care of a Chriſtian Parent, is not that which principally ſounds their Right to Baptiſm, but a Providential Removing of that obſtacle as to their being Baptiſed, to which they had a prior and fundamental Claim, by vertue of that double Publication.

5*thly.* This is plainly contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap:* 25. where the viſible Church is ſaid to conſiſt of ſuch as Profeſs the true Religion, and their Children. And *Chap:* 28. *Par:* 4. And the parallel Queſtions in the *Shorter and Larger Catechiſms,* where the Perſons to be Baptiſed, are ſaid to be Profeſſing Chriſtians, and their Children. To this Mr. *Simſon* anſwers, That his Opinion is about a Queſtion, that neither the *Confeſſion* nor *Catechiſms*

techiſms do Determine; becauſe in theſe places it is ſaid, That the Infants of one or more of Believing Parents ought to be Baptiſed, but Determines nothing about the Infants of Heathens, falling Providentially into the Hands of Chriſtians, but this is of a piece with his Anſwer, to that place of the *Confeſſion of Faith*, about Elect Infants, and is but a pitiful ſhift, and to make but a Noſe of Wax of the *Confeſſion of Faith*, and *Catechiſms*, for do not the forecited places plainly deſcribe, who are Members of the Viſible Church, *viz.* Profeſſors and their Children, and tell us, that none without the Viſible Church are to be Baptiſed; till they Profeſs their Faith; and that the Children of thoſe who are Members of the Viſible Church are to be Baptiſed: From which it is plain, *1ſt.* That none without the Church are to be Baptiſed, till they make Profeſſion of their Faith. *2dly.* That Children of Heathens are without the Church, as well as their Parents, and Conſequently they being uncapable of making a Confeſſion of their Faith, are not to be Baptiſed, until they are able to do this. *3dly.* It is only the Priviledge of ſuch Infants, as are Children of Chriſtians to be allowed Baptiſm; ſo that the *Confeſſion of Faith* deſcribing who may be Baptiſed: It is plain, that this is not the Priviledge of the Infants of Heathens, even tho' they be under the care of the Chriſtians, unleſs we ſuppoſe this Deſcription of the Perſons, to be Baptiſed to be mank, and to want a full Enumeration. His ſuppoſing that Children by Adoption may be here meaned is ſuch a groſs Corruption of the Senſe of the Words, that I wonder much of his bold-

oldneſs; but this is not the only inſtance of his hus making bold with the *Confeſſion of Faith*, to vreſt it for countenancing *his new Doctrine*. For vhile we are told who are to be Baptiſed, others ot named are thereby plainly ſecluded.

He alledges two Divines as of the ſame Judgnent with himſelf upon this Head. As, 1*ſt*. *Waeus Loc: Com: de Baptiſmo Pag:* 491. And ſays, That he follows *Auguſtin de gratia et Lib: arbitrio, Cap:* 22. And adduces theſe Scriptures named by *Waeus*, for this end, *Gen:* 17 12. To this we anſwer, t's true, *Walæus* is of that Judgment, in the place ited by him. But 1*ſt*. It's as certain, that Mr. *Simſon* in this Contradicts the *Confeſſion of Faith*. *adly*. He Contradicts the *Synod of Dort*, whoſe judgment in this I ſhall ſet down, as it's rendered n *Engliſh* by the Author of the *Eſſay, to Vindicate ſome Scripture Truths in five ſeveral Articles. Act: Syn: Dort: 4to: Par:* 1. *Pag:* 53. The Words are as follows, *As to the Infants of Heathens, who either in regard of their Non-age, or their not underſtanding the Language where they are, are not capable of Inſtruction; albeit by Adoption or aſſumption they be taken into Chriſtian Families; yet it is Judged by the Plurality of the Suffrages of this Synod, that they ought not to be Baptiſed before they attain theſe Years, that according to their Capacity, they may be previouſly initiated in the Knowledge of the Chriſtian Religion, and be inſtructed therein, &c.* See *Acta Synod: Dord: in 4to: Par:* 1. *Pagina* 53. 3ly. He Contradicts the Body of Orthodox Divines, as *Calvin: Alting: Bucan: Turret: Chamier: Ameſ: Wend, &c.* See *Chamier Contractus de Perſonis in Baptiſmo, Cap:* 11. *Pag:* 1420. *Ameſii Medul: Theol: Pag:* 194. *de Baptiſmo,*

Cap.

Cap: 11. § 11, & 12. *Bucan*: *Loc*: *Com*: *Pag*: 622: *Wendel*: 364. *Turret*: *Part*: 3*tia Pag*: 427.

4. IF this were the only Error Mr. *Simſon* Maintains, it were more Tolerable: But it's obſervable, that as ſeveral of the Orthodox Divines have the Crochets of ſome Error, or other cleaving unto them, ſo Mr. *Simſon* licks up the Chaf that cleaves not to one, but to ſeverals of them, with greater Earneſtneſs than he embraces their ſound Doctrine. And *Wallæus* in the forecited place tells us, That *Beza* is of the contrary Judgment. As to the Teſtimonies cited out of *Marckius*, the Expreſſion is very general; for among the ſeveral ſorts of the Infants of them within the Covenant, that may be Baptiſed, he Mentions Children by Adoption in general; but does not tell what kind of Adoption he Means, whether it be the Adopting of Heathen Infants, or the Adopting of Chriſtian Infants whoſe Parents being Dead, have no near Relation to Engage for them. As to the Scriptures cited out of *Walæus*, we anſwer, 1*ſt*. *Gen*: 17. 12. Will not prove his Purpoſe, where it's ſaid he that is Born in thy Houſe, or bought with Money, muſt needs be Circumciſed. For it is plain, Adult Heathens bought by the *Jews*, were not Circumciſed, till they were inſtructed in the Principles of the *Jewiſh* Religion, and profeſſed the ſame; And ſo the Children of ſuch Heathens, had a Right to Circumciſion, by their Parents being taken within the Covenant: And as for other Infants, it ſeems plain enough, that the *Jews* would not be very fond of buying little Infants, without their Parents alſo; which was rather a Loſs, than an Advantage to them.

As

As for the Second Scripture, *Act:* 2. 39. It plainly proves the contrary, as we have already hinted. For to include Children by Adoption in these Words, *The Promise is to you, &c.* I conceive is a doing Violence to the Words of the Text.

ER'E I conclude this Chapter, I take notice of a Proposition, which he says he refutes as a gross Error. The Proposition is, *Pag: 99. of his Defences*, the Words are as follow, *This second Proposition is also capable of this ill Sense*, viz. *That Christ is the universal Remedy for* Jews, *&c. who shall be saved by him, if they live honestly according to the Rules of their respective Religions*; we see that he calls this a gross Error.

I desire this may be compared with a double Position, he lays down in his third Letter to Mr. *Rowan Pag:* 10. dated *Glasgow January* 14*th.* 1712. Which Positions he thinks the only Expedient whereby to account for GOD's Goodness and Righteousness towards the Souls of *Adam's* Posterity, who, tho' they are all pure as they come from the Creator, yet without any sinful Act of theirs, are united to Bodies, whereby they become necessarly polluted with sin, *&c.* The first Proposition, which in his Opinion answers this, is, *1st. That there had been no Propogation of Mankind, if a Remedy for sin had not been provided.* The Second Proposition is, *That the Gospel is published to all, and whole Mankind, wherever they are, either more Explicitly or Implicitly, so that they may obtain Eternal Salvation, if they will use that Knowledge in a due Manner; if they would Pray to GOD, they would obtain Mercy, altho' not in that Manner wherein we do. Which Proposition if rightly expressed (which he says is not in Mr.* Rowan's *Letter) he affirms will not Admit Mr.* Rowan's *Consequences,*

ſequences, but on the contrary, ſerve to refute theſe Errors.

Now *1ſt.* If this laſt Propoſition be not the very ſame, with the Propoſition we juſt now ſet down, or near a Kin to it, which Mr. *Simſon* ſays, He refutes as a groſs Error any may judge. *2dly*, As to the Propoſition it ſelf, *viz.* That the Goſpel is publiſhed to all Mankind, either more implicitly or explicitly, ſo as that they may obtain Eternal Salvation, if they will uſe that Knowledge rightly, we conceive is ſuch a groſs Error, as *Arminians* and *Socinians* maintain nothing groſſer on this head: For beſides the Univerſality of the Covenant of Grace, which he here plainly aſſerts, he *1ſt.* Deſtroys the neceſſity of the ordinary Means of Salvation. *2dly.* He makes the Gate to Heaven wonder large: For Heathens according to him may get Salvation if they will. *3dly.* He puts it in the power of Heathens to uſe the Revelation they have rightly. *4thly.* Makes the Condition of Heathens little hopeleſſer than that of Chriſtians; For according to him, it is in Heathens power to obtain Eternal Salvation, *&c.* *5thly.* He makes Salvation without the Church, not only poſſible, but eaſy: For according to him, Heathens may obtain Salvation, if they will uſe that Knowledge rightly.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning GOD's Providence.

HEre Profeſſor *Simſon, Pag:* 120. lays down ſeveral Propoſitions, which he diſowns: As, 1ſt.

1*st*: *That the Providence of* GOD *with respect to sinful Actions, is only a bare Permission, as* Arminians *and* Jesuits *hold.* This Proposition he says, he yearly refutes.

A second Proposition is, *That* GOD *hath not a full and absolute Dominion over Mens free Actions.* This *Pelagian* Error he says he yearly refutes.

PROPOSITION Third, *That he denies all concurse of* GOD *with Men's Actions, and owns only a giving Men Faculties and Powers of acting and conserving these Powers,* which is the Error of *Durandus and a Dola.* This Error he says he refutes yearly, yea, that he refutes all the four *Pelagian* Schemes, *viz. Mera virium conservatio, simplex communis legis datio, generalis motus a creaturis determinandus, actus* DEI *simultaneus in actionem, non in agens influens.*

PROPOSITION Fourth, *That he Teaches what is near a Kin to the* Jesuits *and* Arminians, *Scientia Media.* This Error he says he also yearly refutes.

A Fifth Proposition is, *That Concursus is nothing else, but the Lords puting the Creature in such Circumstances, in which the Creature being placed, doth without any previous or pre-determining Influence upon it, freely, yet infallibly produce the decreed Effect.* This Description of *Concursus* he denies to be his.

As to what he teaches on this Subject, he says he owns the Description of Providence, given in the 5. *Chap:* of our *Confession of Faith.* And so he distinguisheth Providence into two Parts. 1*st.* GOD's Preserving. 2*dly.* GOD's Governing all his Creatures and all their Actions.

As to this last Branch, he delivers his Opinion in the following Particulars. 1*st. Governing Providence is that Holy and Wise Exercise of the Power of*

GOD

GOD, the first Cause whereby he ordereth all the Motions and Actions of his Creatures whatsomever, with all their Effects, to come to pass, immediately and infallibly, according to his own Eternal Decree and Foreknowledge, &c. And this Description he thinks sufficient, both for *Gubernatio* and *Concursus, &c.*

2. As to the particular way how GOD thus Exercises his Governing Power in many Cases he says, he, neither doth nor can pretend to determine, only he owns, *There is a certain and infallible Connection betwixt the Eternal Decree of GOD, and Events in time even to the least, &c.*

BUT the asserting of previous *Concursus* is not a determining the particular way of his Governing Power; For Divines do not pretend to explain the particular way of that Concurse, tho' they judge the thing in General necessary to be maintained.

3. HE says, *That as to the way of Explaining this Connection,* viz. *by an immediate previous Physical impulse, and Motion of the Creature in all its Actions, even these that are most sinful, and necessarly Evil, which* Marck: *and many others follow,* he freely owns he is not satisfied with, *1st.* Because it doth rather increase than diminish difficulties. *2dly.* Because he sees nothing from Scripture or Reason for it.

BUT now we see him opening; For, *1st:* He plainly owns, *That he is not for* Physicus Præcursus, *in all the free Actions of Men.* 2dly: He Confesses, *that herein he differs from all Orthodox Divines,* and I never heard, or read of a Divine esteemed Orthodox, who denied this *Physicus Concursus* in Actions intrinsically Evil, except Doctor *Strang,* who was condemned upon that account by the Assembly

bly of this Church; and I have been much grieved to hear, that ſome Miniſters have cenſured that Aſſembly, as dealing too ſeverely with Mr: *Strang*: For if our Aſſemblies had not thus ſeverely cenſured budding Errors, we had not enjoyed that Meaſure of Purity of Doctrine we now have. And if our Aſſemblies ſlacken in their Zeal in cenſuring ſpringing Errors, we cannot expect to enjoy Purity of Doctrine long. 3*dly*. We may ſee afterwards, whether the difficulties be encreaſed or diminiſhed, by aſſerting this *Phyſicus Concurſus*, as he touches upon any of them. 4*thly*. All the ſame difficulties recur from aſſerting the Eternal, Antecedent and fixed Decree, which Decree he expreſly owns; according to which Decree all Actions of Men, even the moſt ſinful, infallibly happen: This is plain to any of a tolerable Knowledge in theſe Controverſies with *Arminians*, ſo that he does the Truth no Service, but betrays a moſt momentuous Doctrine of our Religion, into the Hands of it's Enemies. 5*thly*. It's ſtrange, he ſees nothing from Scripture or Reaſon for this *Phyſicus Concurſus*: When all Orthodox and Polemick Divines, who have written upon this Subject, have adduced ſo many weighty Arguments from Scripture, and Scripture Reaſons for proving this *Concurſus* againſt *Papiſts* and *Arminians*, as *Twiſſ*: *Turret*: *Wendel*: *Rutherfoord*, *Marck*, *Witſ*: *&c.* does not Mr. *Simſon* condemn all theſe Arguments as weak and inſignificant; and condemn all theſe Divines, as proving ſuch a weighty Point from Scriptures, which had no Foundation in them for ſuch a Doctrine.

4. HE ſays, *page* 124. altho' he determine not the Way how GOD does it; *Yet he thinks*

that

that GOD *may determine infallibly, all the Actions of Reasonable Creatures, that are not above their Natural Powers, and are not contrary to their Natural Inclinations, and Dispositions, by placing them in such Circumstances, by which they have a certain Series and Train of Motives laid before them, by which they may infallibly, yet freely produce such a Series of Actions as he has decreed.*

AND this Way he thinks, *may be sufficient for ascertaining all the Events of Sinful Actions, and of the ordinary Natural, and Civil Actions of Men; but acknowledges, that in the case of all gracious Actions, and such as are above our Natural Powers, and contrar to our Inclinations, and present Dispostions; that this Way cannot be sufficient, but that Divine Illumination, and continual Influences of Grace are necessary*: And says, *That then this immediate Power of* GOD, *doth not diminish, but increase their Natural Liberty*: And says further, *That if such an immediate Power of* GOD, *be applyed to Men in all their Sinful Actions, that it would diminish their Liberty, and would be hard to be reconciled, with the Holiness of* GOD: *And therefore thinks, that from Predetermination in Gracious Actions, no Consequence can be drawn from it's having Place in sinful Actions, or from it's being needless in sinful Actions, that it is not necessary in Gracious Actions.*

NOW let us consider these Things a little, *First*, It is plain, That he owns Physical *Præcursus* in no Actions, but gracious Ones; so that in all Civil and Natural Actions of Men, there is no need of this Physical *Præcursus*; which how contrary to Scripture, and all Reformed Divines is obvious: And to what absurdities this opens a

Doo

Door, any may obſerve. *2dly.* I conceive it would be hard for him to diſtinguiſh this Doctrine of his, from ſeveral of the Propoſitions, he diſowned as his.

As to the firſt Propoſition, concerning a bare Permiſſion, this Doctrine ſeems to be very near a Kin to it; for the Teachers of this Doctrine of Permiſſion, do allow a placing of Men in ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances, as ſuit their preſent Diſpoſitions; only they Deny, that Sin follows infallibly upon their being put in ſuch Circumſtances, which Mr. *Simſon* affirms: But he and they agree in the main. *Firſt*, in denying this Phyſical *Præcurſus*. 2. In extending GOD's Providential Operation about Mens Actions, no further, than to a placing them in ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* And making ſuch and ſuch Objects, and Tentations caſt up in their Way.

2 IT will be hard for him to maintain GOD's Abſolute Dominion over Mens free Actions; for, tho' the Eternal and Unchangeable Decree ſecures the Futurition of Mens Actions, according to the Decree; yet his Way of explaining how GOD in his Providence infallibly orders Mens Actions, *viz. By putting them in ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances, &c.* deſtroys GOD's abſolute and full Dominion over Mens free Actions; for thereby, his Dominion over Mens Actions is but indirect, *viz.* By putting them in ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* And conſequently not abſolute: For he owns not an internal, and immediate influence upon the Acts of Mans Will, all the Operation of Providence he owns is only objective and external.

3.

3. HE will be ſtraitned, to diſtinguſh his Doctrine on this Head, from the Doctrine of *Durandus* and *a Dola*, which is the third Propoſition he refuſed; For all he adds more, is the putting of Men into ſuch Circumſtances, whereby they have a certain Train of Motives offered to them, *&c.* (as alſo he owns a previous and infallible Decree, which I know not if they do) but this makes no material difference, as to GOD's Providential Government, for all the influence of theſe Motives, is but external and Moral, and here GOD's Providential Government, is conſidered abſtract from the Decree, and I ſuppoſe, that they of *Durandus* Way, beſides the giving Men Powers and Laws and preſerving theſe Powers, will own a putting Men in into ſuch Circumſtances, whereby ſuch motives occur, tho' I wot not if they do own the infallable connexion, between the Circumſtances and Mens Actions, which Mr. *Simſon* does, and in that caſe Mr. *Simſon* and they agree, as to the Nature of GOD's Providential Operations upon Mens Actions, *viz.* That it is only external by putting Men into ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* For Mr. *Simſon* owns no further Operation of Providence upon Mens free Actions, that are not gracious, and the infallible following of the Action; or only the probable following of it upon the other ſide, makes no material alteration in the Nature of the Providential Operation, which on either ſide is but only external and Objective.

4. NOR do I ſee, but that this Doctrine is near a Kin to *Scentia media*, which is the fourth Propoſition he refuſed; for if GOD put Men into

into ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* then he muſt have decreed to have put them into ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* Now in that caſe, GOD foreſees the Train of Actions ſuch a Series of Motives, will influence Men to produce, and then GOD either foreſees the Futurition of theſe Actions, becauſe GOD having once decreed to place them into ſuch Circumſtances; he knows that the Train of Motives to be laid before them, will infallibly have this Effect upon their free Will, as to make them produce ſuch Actions; and if ſo, if this be not *Scientia media*, I know not what is to be ſo called. Or, 2*dly*. He foreſees the Futurition of ſuch Actions; becauſe he hath not only decreed to put them into ſuch Circumſtances; but alſo to work inwardly and powerfully by them upon their Wills and other Powers, yet Holily; but this he denys, tho' it be our common Doctrine. Or, 3*dly*. There is no more, but the Decree eſtabliſhing the Connection betwixt ſuch a Series of Motives, and the Mans free Actions, without any exerting of a powerful, internal and Providential Operation in, and by ſuch Motives, and from this he ſeems not to be very averſe, *pag.* 132: *of his Defencer*. But *firſt*, This is to deſtroy all GOD's Providential Government about Mens free Actions, except putting them into ſuch Circumſtances, in making ſuch a Train of Motives to caſt up, in their Way, which I think is pretty groſs, for it makes GOD's Dominion over Mens free Actions to be only external and indirect. 2*dly*. This is contrary to all ſound Divinity, which beſide the Decree, allows alſo the interveening of a mighty Power put forth for the

Execution of the Decree. 3*dly*. In that caſe Men, for the producing of the moſt Noble Heroick Moral Actions, need to pray for no more, than to be put into ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* But I would think, that this is groſs enough Doctrine.

4. MIGHT not one the ſame Way ſay, That there is no need of any internal ſaving Influence of the Spirit, to produce gracious Actions; For is not the Decree as ſufficient to determine; a Believer to produce Spiritually good Actions, being put into ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances without a new and internal Operation, as in the firſt caſe it is ſufficient, to impreſs ſuch a Train of Motives with ſuch a vertue as the Man meeting with them, ſhall infallibly produce ſuch civil Actions, without any diſtinct and Phyſical Concurſe upon the Will: Sure if the laſt can be maintained, ſo may the firſt, whereby all the internal Oeconomy of the Spirit is deſtroyed.

5. IF this be not the ſame with the fifth Propoſition, containing a deſcription of Providential Concurſe, which he ſays, is not his, any may judge. The deſcription is as follows, *Concurſus then is nothing elſe, but the* LORD's *(according to His moſt Wiſe Decree) putting the Creature in ſuch Circumſtances, in which the Creature being placed, doth without any previous, or predetermining Influence upon it, freely yet infallibly produce the decreed Effect.* Now if this be not the ſame, tho' not ſo fully expreſſed with what Mr. *Simſon* ſays as to the Way of GOD's determining infallibly all the Actions of Reaſonable Creatures, that are not above their Natural Powers, nor contrary to their preſent Diſpoſitions. *viz.* By placing them in

in ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances by which they have a certain Train of Motives laid before them, by which they may infallibly yet freely produce ſuch a Series of Actions as he has decreed, any may judge.

BUT let us yet conſider this Doctrine a little further. *1ſt.* It's plain he denies all internal concurſe and Influx upon Men's Actions (gracious ones excepted) *and requires nothing, but the putting them in ſuch Circumſtances, wherein a train of Motives ſuitable to their preſent Diſpoſition caſts up to them.* If this be not but courſe Divinity, any may Judge. *2dly.* It plainly Deſtroys one branch of the Spirit's Oeconomy, *viz.* as to his common and internal Influences upon Men, in the Exerciſe of common Gifts, which is groſs and contrary to Scripture: See *1 Cor:* 12. For in Actions, that are not above Mens natural Powers (ſuch as is the Exerciſe of common Gifts) nor contrary to their preſent Inclinations (which is frequent in Hypocrites as to the Exerciſe of their common Gifts) according to him there is no Need of any thing, but the placing of them in ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* So that all common internal Aſſiſtance, and Influence of the Spirit to exerciſe ſuch Gifts, according to him muſt be needleſs. *3dly.* Then, to make a Man morally ſerious, there needs no more, but the placing him in ſuch Circumſtances as are agreeable to his preſent Temper (for he denies any *Phyſical Influx* in Actions that are not gracious) whereupon moral Seriouſneſs; and conſequently Converſion infallibly follows. I would incline to think, That this looks very

like the Papists *Vocatio congrua*; And if according to this Doctrine, some might not judge GOD pretty severe in not putting, many more Men in such happy Circumstances; since the putting them in such Circumstances is GOD's Work, and since their being morally serious; and so their Conversion follows infallibly upon their being plac'd in such happy Circumstances. 4*thly*. Upon Supposition, Men are placed in Circumstances disagreeable to their present Temper, I would know whether it be in their Power, without any *Physical Influx*, to be morally serious; if it be in their Power, in that Case to be morally serious, this is contrar to what he himself asserts, *Pag*: 124. where he says, *That in that Case, the putting them in Circumstances*, &c. is not sufficient: If it be not in their Power to be morally serious, then Men need a physical Influx to produce Actions that are not gracious, *&c.*. If the Circumstances they are in suit not their present Dispositions. 5*thly*. Will he say, That Men never produce morally good Actions, but when they are plac'd in such Circumstances, as suit their present Temper? This is contrar to Experience; and brings in a *Stoick* and Star-like Necessity upon Men; but if they do produce such Actions notwithstanding the Circumstances be disagreeable to their present Dispositions: Then what he here asserts is false, *viz.* That to produce such Actions, Men must be placed in Circumstances, agreeing to their present Tempers, or else they need an internal and physical Concurse; which he allows not, but in gracious Actions. 6*thly*. I would know why he says, *That Men having such a Train of Motives laid be-*

before them, may infallibly produce ſuch a Series of Actions; for either their producing ſuch a Series of Actions, upon their being put in ſuch Circumſtances, ever and infallibly follows. And then why does he not ſay ſo much roundly? or if their producing ſuch a Series of Actions, upon their being put in ſuch Circumſtances, be only probable, how doth he aſcertain the Connection betwixt the Decree and all Events of Time? *7thly*. Then Men need not pray for the common Aſſiſtance of the Spirit in their natural and civil Actions, and the Exerciſe of their common Gifts; but only to be put in ſuch Circumſtances, whereby ſuch a Train of Motives is laid before them, as agree to their preſent Diſpoſition; which I would think is but courſe Divinity, and contrary to Scripture, which tells us, That it is not in Man which walks to direct his own Steps. *8thly*. I would know whence the infallible Connexion betwixt their being put in ſuch Circumſtances, and their producing ſuch a Series of Actions, thereupon flows. For either it ariſes from the exact Suitableneſs, that is betwixt the Man's preſent Diſpoſition, and the Train of Motives laid before him; and if ſo, I am much miſtaken, if this look not very like the *Papiſts*, *Vocatio de congruo*, or it muſt flow ſimply from the Decree eſtabliſhing the Connection betwixt theſe two, without any interveening Application of a divine Power upon Man's Faculties, in Order to his producing ſuch Actions: And if ſo, then this deſtroys all GOD's providential Operations about Men's Actions, except putting them in ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* But if ſo, there is no internal Operation of Providence at all about

like the Papists *Vocatio congrua*; And if according to this Doctrine, some might not judge GOD pretty severe in not putting, many more Men in such happy Circumstances; since the putting them in such Circumstances is GOD's Work, and since their being morally serious; and so their Conversion follows infallibly upon their being plac'd in such happy Circumstances. 4*thly*. Upon Supposition, Men are placed in Circumstances disagreeable to their present Temper, I would know whether it be in their Power, without any *Physical Influx*, to be morally serious; if it be in their Power, in that Case to be morally serious, this is contrar to what he himself asserts, *Pag*: 124. where he says, *That in that Case, the putting them in Circumstances*, &c. is not sufficient: If it be not in their Power to be morally serious, then Men need a physical Influx to produce Actions that are not gracious, *&c.*. If the Circumstances they are in suit not their present Dispositions. 5*thly*. Will he say, That Men never produce morally good Actions, but when they are plac'd in such Circumstances, as suit their present Temper? This is contrar to Experience; and brings in a *Stoick* and Star-like Necessity upon Men; but if they do produce such Actions notwithstanding the Circumstances be disagreeable to their present Dispositions: Then what he here asserts is false, *viz.* That to produce such Actions, Men must be placed in Circumstances, agreeing to their present Tempers, or else they need an internal and physical Concurse; which he allows not, but in gracious Actions. 6*thly*. I would know why he says, *That Men having such a Train of Motives laid* be-

before them, may infallibly produce ſuch a Series of Actions; for either their producing ſuch a Series of Actions, upon their being put in ſuch Circumſtances, ever and infallibly follows. And then why does he not ſay ſo much roundly? or if their producing ſuch a Series of Actions, upon their being put in ſuch Circumſtances, be only probable, how doth he aſcertain the Connection betwixt the Decree and all Events of Time? *7thly*. Then Men need not pray for the common Aſſiſtance of the Spirit in their natural and civil Actions, and the Exerciſe of their common Gifts; but only to be put in ſuch Circumſtances, whereby ſuch a Train of Motives is laid before them, as agree to their preſent Diſpoſition; which I would think is but courſe Divinity, and contrary to Scripture, which tells us, That it is not in Man which walks to direct his own Steps. *8thly*. I would know whence the infallible Connexion betwixt their being put in ſuch Circumſtances, and their producing ſuch a Series of Actions, thereupon flows. For either it ariſes from the exact Suitableneſs, that is betwixt the Man's preſent Diſpoſition, and the Train of Motives laid before him; and if ſo, I am much miſtaken, if this look not very like the *Papiſts*, *Vocatio de congruo*, or it muſt flow ſimply from the Decree eſtabliſhing the Connection betwixt theſe two, without any interveening Application of a divine Power upon Man's Faculties, in Order to his producing ſuch Actions: And if ſo, then this deſtroys all GOD's providential Operations about Men's Actions, except putting them in ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* But if ſo, there is no internal Operation of Providence at all about

bout Mens free Actions. Sure when *Ahab* was inticed to go up to *Ramoth-Gilead*, there was more of a providential Operation, than a meer tryſting together of *Ahab*'s Inclination to go up to *Ramoth*, and the flattering Encouragments of his *falſe Prophets* that ſuited his preſent Humor, as all our Divines, that treat on this Head ſhew. Sure at this Rate GOD's providential Operations about Men's free Actions, is no more than what Satan's Influence upon them is: For he alſo makes ſuch Circumſtances come in their Way, as ſuiting their ſinful Inclinations, he thereby draws them into Sin. *9thly*. I want to know what it is that GOD hath decreed, as to the Production of theſe Actions? It muſt either be the giving his internal Influence, and Motion upon their Wills, for the producing of ſuch Actions: But this he expreſly refuſes; or it's only to place them in the above-named Circumſtances; and if ſo, I am at a Loſs how to diſtinguiſh it from the Jeſuites Doctrine upon this Branch of Man's Actions: For they allow all he ſays here, only with this Difference, That they deny that Mens Actions follow infallibly upon their being put in ſuch Circumſtances; but as to the Nature of GOD's Concurſe in it ſelf about theſe Actions, he and they ſeem to agree. Yea, they allow more than he ſeems to do; for they grant a general internal Concurſe. *10thly*. If this phyſical Concurſe in Actions civil, *&c.* leſſen Man's Liberty, it will do ſo alſo in gracious Ones in which he allows this Concurſe: For the Reaſon given by him againſt this Concurſe in the firſt Kind of Actions, will alſo militate a-

againſt it in the ſecond Kind; becauſe ſo alſo, Man will be but a Machine in the producing of gracious Actions. 11*thly*. He ſays, He fears ſome may make a Jeſt of that common Diſtinction of GOD's phyſical Concurſe as to the phyſical Entity of the Action, and his permiſſive, limiting and over-ruling Providence, as to the Irregularity of the Action. I am ſorry he ſhould make a Jeſt of the Doctrine taught by the Scripture and by all our Orthodox Divines. He ſeems to ſpeak in the Dialect of *Limburgh* the *Arminian*. 12*thly*. He ſays, That where the Action is contrar to our Inclination and preſent Diſpoſition, this Way is not ſufficient. Now he underſtands this either of gracions Actions: And if ſo, then if the gracious Action be not contrar to the Man's preſent Temper; then he needs not this phyſical Concurſe to produce the ſame. Or he underſtands it only of civil and natural Actions which are contrary to the Man's preſent Diſpoſition; and then it will follow at leaſt, that in that Caſe this phyſical Concurſe is neceſſary to the producing of ſuch Actions: And if ſo, I would know whether this Concurſe deſtroys Man's Liberty in the producing of ſuch Actions? If it do, this is plainly abſurd. If it do not, far leſs doth it deſtroy Man's Liberty in producing ſuch Actions, as are agreeable to his preſent Temper 13*thly*. His Argument drawn againſt divine Concurſe in ſinful Actions, will alſo ſtrick againſt this Concurſe in gracious Actions; for there being a ſinful Mixture of Imperfection in the beſt Actions of Believers, it will be found hard according to his Way of arguing,

to

to ſeparate the Irregularity of the Action, from the Action it ſelf; as is plain to any that conſiders it; for even in Hatred againſt GOD (which is an Act intrinſically evil) the Act *viz.* Hatred is as ſeparable from the Irregularity of it, *viz.* it's going out upon a wrong Object, *viz.* GOD as the Act of Faith in believers, is ſeparable from the Mixture of Unbelief and other Imperfections in Believers.

I conceive it needleſs, directly to prove this Phyſical Concurſe; becauſe This is done fully and plainly by all Orthodox Divines who have written on this Head.

He ſays *pag:* 126. That his denying of this immediate and previous Concurſe, is not contrar to the fifth Chapter of the *Confeſſion of Faith, Parag:* 4. *1ſt.* Becauſe no Words in that *Paragraph* are capable of being underſtood of ſuch a Concurſe. *2dly.* Becauſe, that theſe Words, That GOD's active Providence extends it ſelf to the ſinful Actions of Angels and Men, *&c.* do not, neceſſarly imply this previous Concurſe, unleſs it were evident, that the Providence of GOD can no otherwiſe extend it ſelf to the Actions of Men, than by this previous Concurſe. *3dly.* Becauſe the *Confeſſion of Faith* mentions ſeveral other Ways, whereby the active Providence of GOD, extends it ſelf to the ſinful Actions of Angels and Men, ſuch as a moſt Wiſe and Powerful Bounding, and otherwiſe ordering and governing of them, *&c.* without giving the leaſt hint of this Phyſical Concurſe.

BUT *Firſt*, it is plain, That denying this Phyſical Concurſe is contrar to the Scriptures, to the Analogy of Faith, and Genius of the Doctrine con-

contained in the *Confeſſion of Faith*: And therefore muſt needs be contrar to the *Confeſſion of Faith* it ſelf. 2*dly*. GOD's Wiſe and Powerful Bounding, *&c.* of Mens ſinful Actions, his blinding and hardning them, his withdrawing his common Aſſiſtance from them, his giving them over to their own Luſts, *&c.* which the *Confeſſion of Faith* includes in GOD's Providence, neceſſarly imply this Concurſe; as is plain. Otherwiſe GOD's internal Operations about Mens free Actions is none at all: And all GOD's Providential Government about Mens Actions is only external and indirect, by making ſuch Circumſtances meet them, as ſuits their preſent Temper, whether good or bad. 3*dly*. Will he ſay, That all GOD's Providential Operations in bounding Men's Corruptions, *&c.* blinding and hardning them, giving them up to their own Luſts, *&c.* conſiſts in his making ſuch Circumſtances and external Objects meet them, as ſuits their corrupt Tempers, and ſo draws out their corruptions to their own further hardning; ſure the *Confeſſion of Faith* far leſs gives ground for this gloſs. This is no more than what Satan does in hardning Men, by making ſuitable Temptations caſt up in their way; This is no more than what *Arminians* own, only they deny the infallible connection betwixt the putting them in ſuch Circumſtances, and Mens ſinning: But the providential Operation is ſtill the ſame, as own'd by Mr. *Simſon* and the *Arminians*. All Orthodox Divines, beſides the external Providences in hardning, do own a ſecret and internal, but holy Operation of Providence. 4*thly*. If Mens ſinning follow infallibly upon GOD's mak-

making ſuch Temptations and Objects caſt up in their Way: It will be hard for Mr. *Simſon* to free GOD from being the Author of ſin, more than, when this Phyſical Concurſe is aſſerted, in and about Mens ſinful Actions: As is plain; for in both caſes Mens ſinning follows infallibly from ſome Providential Operation of GOD about Men. According to Mr. *Simſon* from an external operation of Providence, and according to Orthodox Divines, from both an internal and external operation of Providence: And *Arminian* Arguments on this Head militate equally againſt all providential Operations, upon which Mens ſinning follows infallibly. 5*thly*. Tho' the *Confeſſion of Faith* make not uſe of the Word Concurſe, it follows not, that it is not included in the Doctrine of Providence; becauſe that Doctrine as delivered in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, neceſſarily implys it, unleſs we ſay, that GOD's hardning ſinners, is no more, but his making ſuch and ſuch Temptations, *&c.* caſt up in their way. Further, there are ſeveral Points not expreſly mentioned in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, becauſe in their nature, not ſo obvious to vulgar Capacity, *E: G*: That GOD's Decrees are the ſame with his Eſſence, which is a very grave Point, and to deny the ſame were a dangerous Error; yet ſo far as I remember, is not expreſly mentioned in the *Confeſſion of Faith*. Laſtly, the Scriptures adduced in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, make it plain, that this Phyſical Concurſe muſt be included, being the ſame Scriptures from which all our Polemick Divines prove this Concurſe:

To this Mr. *Simſon* anſwers, 1*ſt*. That if the Scriptures

Scriptures adduced prove this Concurſe, it's ſtrange that they do not plainly aſſert it. *2dly.* He denies, That the Scriptures there mentioned prove any ſuch Concurſe; Or that the Authors of of the *Confeſſion* meant any ſuch thing, when they ſay that the Providence of GOD extends it ſelf to the ſins of Men, and for that end deſires, that 2 *Sam:* 24. 1. with 1 *Chron:* 21. 1. and both theſe be compared with the fifth Paragraph. But *1ſt.* it is no more ſtrange, that this Concurſe is not expreſly mentioned in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, than a great many other Terms of Divinity which are not found in the *Confeſſion of Faith.* *2dly.* If the Scriptures mentioned in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, do not prove this Concurſe, then all our Divines, who in their ſeveral Syſtems prove at length from theſe Scriptures and the like, this Concurſe, have been guilty of a great Blunder, in proving ſuch a momentuous Point from Scriptures, that did not Warrant it; by which he Juſtifies the *Arminians* in their denying this previous Phyſical Concurſe, againſt all Orthodox Divines. *3dly.* When he deſires 2 *Sam:* 24. 1. to be compared with 1 *Chron.* 21. 1. If his Deſign be to ſhew, that the meaning of the firſt Scripture, where GOD is ſaid to move *David* to number *Iſrael*, is only, that GOD did ſo, by ſuffering Satan to Tempt *David* to do it; We would Notice, that this is the *Arminian* Anſwer to this Argument drawn from 2 *Sam:* 24. 1. And ſo he delivers up this Scripture and the like, with the Point of Doctrine they are adduced to prove into the Hands of our Adverſaries. *4thly.* It ſeems that when GOD moved *David* to number *Iſrael*, and when he leads Men into

into Temptation, he does no more, but makes ſuch Temptations meet them, as ſuit their Corruptions, and withdraws his preventing Grace, without any further influence upon their inward Powers; But certainly the expreſſion of Moving, Hardening, Leading, *&c.* imply beſide ſome poſitive influx upon the Powers of the Soul: For *Arminians* grant all this, that Mr. *Simſon* allows: Only they deny the infallible connection betwixt Mens ſinning, and theſe forementioned Acts of GOD; but the providential Government about Mens ſins as owned by *Arminians* and Mr. *Simſon*, is the ſame in it's Nature.

HE ſays, *Pag*: 128. *That he yearly refutes the bare Permiſſion of* Jeſuits *and* Arminians, *and teaches, that Divine Providence does ſo powerfully and effectually Govern all ſinful Actions, as that all of them readily fall out according to GOD's Eternal Decree*, and that he cites for this Purpoſe the 10. of *Iſa*: *&* 6. and ſeveral other Texts of Scripture. But we have had occaſion already to remark how near his Doctrine comes to the Jeſuits Permiſſion; For he owns no providential Act, about Mens free actions, but what they own, as the putting Men in ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* only he owns the infallible Connection, which they deny, which no way alters the abſtract nature of the Providence. 2*dly*. I would know, wherein the Power of Providence as explained by Mr. *Simſon*, whereby Mens ſinful actions infallibly fall out, doth conſiſt: For it muſt either conſiſt in an internal Phyſical Influx, which he denies; or in the ſuiting of the Circumſtances with Mens Temper. (and it's in this Mr. *Simſon* ſeems to place GOD's Providence about Mens free

free actions) But 1*ſt*. any may ſee how dull Divinity it is, to place all the efficacy of GOD's Providence in the ſuitableneſs of the Circumſtances and Motives (which he makes caſt up in their way) to their preſent Temper. 2*dly*. Any may ſee, that this makes GOD's Providence about Mens free actions only external. 3*dly*. It makes Satans Influence upon Mens ſinning, conſidered in it ſelf, as powerful as GOD's Providence ; For Satan alſo makes Temptations to meet Men that exactly ſuit with their preſent ſinful Diſpoſition. 4*ly*: Will he ſay, That when, *Iſa*: 10. 6. GOD is ſaid to ſend the *Aſſyrian* againſt the *Jews*, that all he did, was by making ſuch occaſions offer, as ſuited to his Ambition and Covetouſneſs ; or when *David* prayed that he would not incline his Heart to Vanity, that all he ſought, was, That he might keep him from ſuch external Temptations, as might draw him thereto. 3*dly*. Or the efficacy of this Providence depends intirely on the antecedent infallible Decree, without the interpoſition of any providential Operation about Mens free actions, except the making ſuch a train of Motives caſt up in their way ; but this we are to conſider afterwards.

WHEN Mr. *Webſter* alledges, That the Scriptures furniſh us with a great many Arguments for this Concurſe in ſinful actions, as when GOD is ſaid to Blind, Harden, and to give up to ſtrong Deluſions, *&c:* For anſwer, he gives only the Words of the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap*: 5. *Par*: 6: *As for theſe Wicked and ungodly Men whom GOD as a righteous Judge, &c*. And refers to Doctor *Twiſs* Explication, of GOD's hardning *Pharaoh*'s Heart

Heart, in his *Vindiciæ Gratiæ, in Fol: Lib:* 2. *Cap:* 11. *Pag:* 93. But Mr. *Simſon* may know that all Orthodox Divines do from theſe Expreſſions, and the like in Scripture of hardning, blinding, prove this phyſical Concurſe in ſinful Actions. 2*dly.* As for the Paragraph of the *Confeſſion of Faith* cited by him: It is plain to any that reads it, That this phyſical Concurſe is contained therein, tho' not expreſſed in ſo many Words. For when GOD witholds his Grace from them, and not only expoſes them to ſuch Objects as their Corruption makes Occaſion of ſinning, but alſo gives them over to their own Luſts. I would know how he would explain, giving them over to their Luſts, without ſome internal, phyſical Operation? whereby he withdraws former Reſtraints; otherwiſe giving them over to their own Luſts, will be Nothing elſe but a Leaving them to ſuch Temptations, as ſuit their Corruption; which is to confound the diſtinct Ways of GOD's blinding and hardning Men, ſpecified in that Paragraph. 3*dly.* As to Doctor *Twiſs*'s Explication of GOD's hardning *Pharaoh*'s Heart, we leave it to any, who ſhall conſult that Place, whether it makes for Mr. *Simſon* or not? And ſince Doctor *Twiſs* at large in that Book diſputes for this previous and phyſical Concurſe in ſinful Actions againſt *Arminians.* Any may judge whether his Explication of GOD's hardning *Pharaoh*'s Heart, will ſuit Mr. *Simſon*'s Doctrine.

HE ſays, That when it is ſaid, *In GOD we live, move and have our Being.* There is no ſuch Thing intimated as this Concurſe, and that the Senſe is only, *That we have our Being and all Principles*

ples of Life and Motion from GOD, *and that he preſerves us, and powerfully governs us and all our Actions according to his own Purpoſe, and for his own Ends.* But 1*ſt*. I would know, how GOD can be ſaid powerfully and infallibly to govern all our Actions? Unleſs this phyſical Influx be own'd: For any will eaſily ſee how blunt it is, to retrain this powerful Governing to GOD's making ſuch a Train of external Motives meet us; and to conceive ſuch an infallible Connection betwixt our internal Actions and ſuch external Motives, without owning an internal providential Operation upon the Powers of the Soul is ſtrange; for GOD interpoſeth the Exerciſe of his Power for executing the Decree. 2*dly*. It ſeems according to this Gloſs, we depend no otherwiſe upon GOD as to our Actings, than we do as to our Beings, when once given us *i. e.* That he only preſerves the Principle of Motion. But 3*dly*. Further the Words plainly ſay, That we depend upon GOD as to our Motions in the ſame Way that we do as to our Beings. Now our Beings are not only preſerv'd but alſo powerfully produc'd by him; and therefore our Actions are not only govern'd and preſerv'd by him, but alſo muſt owe their firſt Being to his powerful and internal Operation; for it's abſurd to ſay, That any Thing that hath a phyſical Entity, ſhould not owe its Exiſtence to the powerful and immediate Operation of GOD: Otherwiſe Mens free Actions in their Preſervation and Government, ſhould not depend immediatly upon GOD; becauſe they do not owe their Being and Exiſtence to the immediate influential Operation of GOD

as

as must needs be, if there be no physical Concurse, but only a preserving of the Rational Creature in the free Exercise of its Powers. 4*thly*, *Durandus*, and *Arminians* will own all Professor *Simson*'s Gloss upon that Scripture: For 1*st*. They will own, That we have our Being and all Principle of Life and Motion from GOD. 2*dly*. That he powerfully preserves us and the Principles of our Actions. 3*dly*. That he powerfully governs us and all our Actions to his own Ends; so that it seems according to him, That Men in Order to act and move freely, need only to have their Beings and Powers preserv'd, which looks very like *Durandus*'s Way; as for making such Motives offer to them, and ordering their Actions when produced to such and such Ends, any of *Durandus*'s Opinion will never refuse.

WHEN Mr. *Webster* alledges, That this physical Concurse is taught by all our Protestant Divines, in their Systems, who have written upon this Subject against *Arminians* and *Jesuits*.

HE answers 1*st*. *That granting it were so, He can oppose to them our* Confession of Faith *and the* Catechisms, *which reject all dangerous Errors advanced against the special and particular Providence of GOD, whether vented by* Arminians, Jesuits, *or others, and asserts the contrary Doctrine, necessary to be believ'd, without the least Mention of this previous physical Concurse:* And further says, *That it is not determin'd in any of the Confessions of the Reformed Churches.* But 1*st*. Is it not a great Prejudice to his Cause, That in this he confesses himself contrar to all the *Polemick* Divines, that have written upon this Subject, and I suppose they understood

and

nd wrote agreeable to the Confeſſions of the ſeveral Churches, to which they did belong. 2*dly*. It's ſtrange, That theſe many Scripture Arguments, adduced by the many eminent Divines, for proving this Concurſe, are by him condemned as weak, yea, as adduced to prove an Error; how great an Advantage is hereby yielded to *Arminians*, and other Enemies of the Truth, againſt whom they diſputed. 3*dly*. Was not Doctor *Strang* in the College of *Glaſgow* condemned by the Aſſembly of this Church, for but denying this Concurſe, in Actions ſimply ſinful. I would ſuppoſe, That they underſtood what was agreeable to the Confeſſion then betwixt which and the *Weſtminſter* Confeſſion, there is a full Agreement. 4*thly*. It ſeems then according to him, That this phyſical Concurſe, is a dangerous Error condemned by the *Confeſſion of Faith*. It ſeems alſo, That the Body of the Miniſters of this Church, and the Profeſſors of the Univerſities before him, have been guilty of a dangerous Error in believing and maintaining this Concurſe; yea, our Aſſemblies have been deeply culpable in not condemning ſuch a dangerous Error contar to the *Confeſſion of Faith*: Yea, it ſeems the Body of the preſent Miniſtry of this Church have not underſtood the *Confeſſion of Faith*: for they have generally believed this Concurſe, and maintained it; and yet he inſinuates, That it is an Error condemned by the *Confeſſion of Faith*. 5*thly*. Tho' the Word *Concurſe*, be not expreſs'd in our Confeſſion, yet any indifferent Perſon may obſerve, That it is neceſſarly implyed in the Explication of the Doctrine, concerning Providence

therein contained; and it follows plainly from the Analogy of our Doctrine. Will he say, That GOD's Eternity having Succession, or his Decrees being distinct from his Essence, are not contrary to the *Confession of Faith*, because not expresly specified there? and yet I suppose both these are dangerous Errors: Does he expect to find all the Terms of Divinity in the *Confession of Faith*? *6thly.* Tho' this Concurse is not expresly mentioned in other *Confessions*, will it follow, That the denying of this Concurse, is not contrary to them? Doth he think, That all Errors contrary to such Confessions, are expresly obviated in them?

2*d.* HE says, It is not true, that this Concurse, is taught by all our Divines, and names, *Calvin Lib:* 1. *Cap:* 16. And *Peter Martyr Loc: Com: Class:* 1. *Cap:* 13, 14. But he cites not particular Place or Words. But 1*st.* Do they teach any Thing contrary to this; yea, do they not teach the same Doctrine? altho' in other Words. Will any say, That the Doctrine of Original Sin was not taught before *Austine*, because the Phrase of *Original Sin* was not used before his Time? 2*dly.* Do these Authors teach his Scheme of the Doctrine of Providence, *viz.* by putting Men into such and such Circumstances, *&c?* 3*dly.* I shall cite a Place out of *Calvin*, which any would think, falls in with the Doctrine *de Concursu*, *Calvin: Inst: Lib:* 2. *Cap:* 18. *Parag:* 2. The Words are as follow, *Quantum ad arcanos motus spectat, quod de corde Regis prædicat* Solomon, *flecti huc vel illuc prout Deo visum est, ad totum certe Humanum Genus ex-*

tenditur

enditur; tantundemque valet, ac ſi dixiſſet, quicquid Animis concipimus arcana DEI inſpiratione, ad ſum finem dirigi, et certe niſi intus operaretur in menibus Hominum, non recte dictum fuiſſet a ſenibus auferre labium, et a veracibus, prudentiam. And a little below, *Quaſi vero non optime conveniunt hæc duo inter ſe, licet diverſis modis Hominem ubi agitur a DEO, ſimul tamen agere.* If the Doctrine of this Concurſe be not there aſſerted, tho' not under the Word of *Phyſicus Concurſus*, I am much miſtaken: For what elſe is this internal Operation upon the Minds of Men, but this Concurſe? Sure it is ſome Thing far beyond putting Men into ſuch Circumſtances, *&c.* And let any but read that 18 *Chap:* of *Calvin*, if he will not ſee this Doctrine ſtrongly aſſerted and proven by *Calvin*, tho' he uſe not the Term of *Phyſicus Concurſus*? As for *Peter Martyr*, he makes as little for him: See 13 *Cap:* referred to, by Profeſſor *Simſon*, *Parag:* 14. *Pag:* 67. The Words in the *Engliſh* are ſo, Things albeit, they in their Nature propend to both Sides, yet are inclined by the Lord more to one Side; and exemplifies this in the Will of *Saul*, when he was to go to *Samuel*; and ſure this looks like phyſical Precurſe. Again, *Pag:* 132. of his Defences, in Anſwer to an Argument brought by Mr. *Webſter* againſt his Doctrine, *viz.* That thereby GOD's Dominion over Mens free Actions muſt be denyed, *&c. He anſwers* 1*ſt.* What would be the Error, if it were ſaid, That the ſame unchangable Act of GOD's Will, by which he decreed all Things from Eternity, brings all Things to paſs in Time? 2*dly.* That tho' this previous Concurſe be de-

nyed, yet there is no Need of denying GOD's Dominion over Mens free Actions, unleſs it can firſt be demonſtrated, That this is the only Way of ſecuring GOD's Omniſcience and Dominion, and that no Body can believe this Dominion, unleſs he know and believe the particular Way, how GOD exerciſeth it. 3*dly*. That this Argument caſts a Reflection upon our own *Confeſſion of Faith*, for omitting this neceſſary Article of Faith, concerning previous, Concurſe. 4*thly*. To ſhew, That the not believing this Concurſe, doth not deſtroy the Faith of GOD's Dominion over Mens free Actions: He cites a double Teſtimony out of *Rutherford* which we ſhall preſently conſider.

Now *firſt*, if the ſimple Decree, without any interveening, internal providential Operation *ad extra*, bring all things decreed to paſs in time, may not one the ſame way deny any Providence of GOD, in governing Heaven and Earth; and ſay, That his eternal Decree brings to paſs all Changes, and Motions in the World, without the Interpoſal of any Divine powerful Operation in time, for the executing the Decree; but I ſuppoſe this were ſtrange Doctrine, and is indeed contrary to Scripture, which plainly aſſerts a powerful operative Providence interveening between the Decree and the Execution thereof. 2*dly*: Might not one ſay, that the ſame way the Decree brings about Converſion and all Acts of Grace in Believers, without any previous Concurſe, which yet he himſelf owns in gracious Actions; for the Decree is as powerful to produce gracious Actions, without any interveening providential operations

as

as indifferent and ſinful Actions. 3*dly*: There is no other way yet fallen upon by Divines, whereby to ſecure this Dominion, but this way, whether this way by putting Men into ſuch and ſuch Circumſtances, whereby ſuch a Train of Motives do caſt up to them, doth ſecure this Dominion, any indifferent Perſon may judge: Sure I am, that in his Scheme of Providence, he ſtands alone, and has none by him, but ſuch *Papiſts* and *Arminians*, who maintain the Doctrine *de Vocatione de Congruo*; beſide that this Antecedent infallible Decree, deſtroys Man's Free-will, as much as the internal Operation or Concurſe, and is as open to *Arminian Arguments*. 4*thly*. The Queſtion is not, Whether a Perſon may not Believe GOD's Dominion over Mens free Actions, who yet knows not the particular way, how GOD exerciſeth this Dominion; but if a Perſon can believe this Dominion, who believes not his ſecret and internal Operations and Motions upon the Powers of Mens Souls, whereby he influenceth and orders all their Internal, as well as their External Actings for his own Ends; And I doubt, that he who believes not this, can ever believe GOD's Dominion over Mens free Actions: Beſides he ſuppoſes, That this way of previous Concurſe is a particular way, whereas it is as general, and more than this way; For no Divine pretends to explain the particular way of GOD's Motions upon the Powers of the Soul, for that remains ſtill a Myſtery, tho' the thing in general be certain from Scripture, and Polemick Divines, who have wrote upon this Subject. 5*thly*. Tho' this Article be not ſo expreſs'd in our and other *Confeſſions of Faith*,

it casts no Reflection upon them, more than the not expres naming of other Points, that are of no less Moment, as we have hinted already. Does he think, That all the Terms of Art, that Divines use in their Polemick Writings, must be found in the *Confessions of Faith*? *6thly.* As to the Testimonies cited out of Mr. *Rutherford*, they are not to his Purpose. The first Testimony in his Book *de Providentia Divina, Cap:* 4. *Pag:* 44. is not for, but against him: Let any but read the Place cited, for that Determination of the Will, whereby it is infallibly bowed, which he only seeks to be granted him, by *Arminians* and *Jesuits*, is Nothing else than the secret Motion of GOD upon the Will, or this *Physicus Concursus*, as is plain, by comparing it with the second Testimony, *Pag:* 402 of his *Exercit: Apolog:* His Words are, *Sed nos de voce physicæ Prædeterminationis, litem non movemus, Quæstio enim est, An non ita moveat voluntatem DEUS, ut sub illa Motione non possit mota non permoveri; vel an non Actio DEI in voluntatem, ita ipsam inflectat, ut non possit non se libere flectere illuc quo DEUS ipsam inclinat*, &c. And then follows the Words cited by Mr. *Simson*, *Quæstio itaque præcipue est, de Indeclinabilitate Actus liberi, quam si quidem illi nobis tribuerint physicæ prædeterminationi valedicere parati sumus.* From which it is plain, That Mr. *Rutherford* maintains such an inward Motion and Operation of GOD upon the Will, as infallibly determines its Operations: And so says, That if this were granted, he could give up with the Expression of physical Predetermination; but it is plain, he maintains the Thing, only

only ſays, That if this were granted, he would not much debate about Words. Let any but read that *Page*, and they will ſee how little it makes for his Purpoſe. We might have directly and at length proven this *Phyſicus Concurſus*, by many ſtrong Arguments; but this would lead us to enlarge too much, and being done fully, and at length by Polemick Divines, we judge it needleſs, only we leave it to any indifferent Perſon, to judge, whether Mr. *Simſon*'s Doctrine on this Head, looks more favourably towards the Orthodox or *Arminian* Way, and in this he ſeems to be ſingular, and ſtand alone in that while he ſeems to own the infallible antecedent Decree, yet he denies this phyſical Influx; for I know none that owns this Decree, that deny the phyſical Influx; as I know none that deny this phyſical Influx who own the infallible antecedent Decree, ſo that he ſeems to be a Mungrel, or a Reconciler of Proteſtant and *Arminian* Doctrine, and as the Endeavours of ſuch have ever been without Succeſs; ſo alſo they ever have been to the Diſadvantage of Truth, like the Marriage of the *Iſraelites* with the *Amorites*.

CHAP. V.

Concerning Man's ULTIMATE END.

THis is the fifth Article of Mr. *Webſters Lybel*, againſt Profeſſor *Simſon*, viz. *The deſire of Reward, and fear of Puniſhment, may not only be a a Motive*, (as our Author *Marckius* ſays,) *but ſhould*

ſhould be the chief Motive, in the Rational Creature, in Worſhipping the Lord; for GOD hath ſo formed the Creature, as chiefly to ſeek it's own good and Happineſs.

TO this the Profeſſor anſwers, *That this is not a diſtinct and true Account of his Opinion*; But whether it be ſo or not, we may have Occaſion to Remark afterward.

2. HE gives an Account of his Opinion in in the following Propoſitions; *1ſt. GOD could have no other, or higher End, in making the World, with Man, and other Rational Creatures in it, than the ſhewing forth the Glory of his excellent Perfections, in, by, and upon them; to which end, they muſt be all ſubſervient, whether in a State of Happineſs or Miſery.* This Propoſition is moſt certain, but the Libel ſpeaks not of GOD's End, but of what is *Man's Ultimate End.*

A ſecond Propoſition he lays down, is, *That no Rational Creature, can love any Perſon, or Thing but under the Notion of real, or apparent good, or what is pleaſant to it ſelf; Nor hate or ſhun any Thing, but under the Notion of real, or apparent Evil, or uneaſineſs to it ſelf; good, real, or apparent with reſpect to it ſelf, being the adequate Object of Love in a Rational Creature, and real and apparent Evil, relative to it ſelf, being the adequate Object of it's Hatred and Averſion.*

BUT if this *Propoſition* be true, then it's the very ſame with the *Propoſition Libelled*; which he ſaid, was not a diſtinct, and true Account of his Opinion; For, if good, real, or apparent, with reſpect to the Creature it ſelf, be the adequate Object of it's Love; ſo that the Rational Creature

ture, cannot love any Thing, but as it's good and pleaſant to it, then certainly *Self*, and ſo deſire of Reward muſt be the chief Motive to Worſhip: For according to this Propoſition, a Man cannot love GOD for himſelf, and as he is Excellent in himſelf; but only as he is good and pleaſant with reference to the Man himſelf; So that according to this Propoſition reſpect to our own Happineſs, is the chief, yea, only Motive of loving GOD.

A third *Propoſition* he owns, is this, *viz. What is conceived by the Rational Creature to be it's chief Good and Happineſs, that it chiefly loves, and ſeeks to obtain, and ſo muſt propoſe, as it's chief End, and Happineſs.* Now this muſt be diſtinguiſhed, The Creature chiefly loves it, for it's own internal Excellency and Perfection, it's true; for it's Relative Goodneſs and ſuteableneſs to it ſelf, it's falſe: For as GOD is firſt infinitely good and excellent in himſelf, and then becauſe of that good to us, ſo our Love ſhould keep the Natural Order. Firſt love him, becauſe of his own Infinite Excellency and Perfection, *i. e.* for Himſelf, *&c.*

PROPOSITION fourth he owns, is, *That GOD hath not only declared himſelf, to be the Author, and beſtower of all good, from the greateſt to the leaſt; but alſo hath propoſed himſelf to Mankind, to be Eternally enjoyed, and glorified by them, as their greateſt End, and chief Good:* Here he joins the enjoying and glorifying GOD together as a Man's chief End, which is very true, if we take Man's Chief End complexly; but yet the enjoying of GOD, and our glorifying him are diſtinct, though really

ly

ly and in themſelves inſeparable Things, and therefore he ſhould have diſtinctly told, which of them he thinks to be Man's *Ultimate End*.

A fifth *Propoſition* he lays down, is, *That as a neceſſary Mean to obtain, this great Good and Happineſs, GOD hath in his Infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs, required that we glorifie him, by whatever we do here on Earth, not only, by propoſing his Honour, as the Chief End of all we do*, &c. *But alſo by promoting it, through the whole Courſe of our Life*, &c. Now *Firſt*, he here ſeems to make Man's own Good, and conſequently Man himſelf, his *Ultimate End*. *2dly*. If glorifying of GOD on Earth, be Man's *Ultimate End* here, will it not be much more ſo in Heaven; for Man never perfectly attains this great End on Earth, *&c.* *3dly*. If the Man's own Happineſs in the enjoying of GOD, be his great End in Heaven, muſt it not be ſo on Earth; for Man hath not one *Ultimate End* on Earth, and another in Heaven.

AND from this he ſays, that it's manifeſt, *That our greateſt Good, or Chief End*, &c. *are ſubordinate to the Glory of GOD*. It's true, all theſe Things are ſubordinate to GOD's own End, *viz.* His glorifying his Rich Grace in and by us, but he does not tell, whether our active glorifying GOD, or our own Happineſs in the enjoying of him for ever, be ſubordinate one to another, and which of them is ſo; for it's of glorifying GOD, as it's our End, not as it's the End, GOD propoſeth to himſelf, about which the Queſtion is.

A ſixth *Propoſition*, he lays down, is, *That every Man is obliged to propoſe to himſelf, as his Chief Good and End, the eternal enjoying, and glorifying of GOD fully*

fully, &c. Now all this is very true, if Man's Chief End be taken more complexly, but he knows, the Queſtion is concerning *Man's Ultimate End*, more ſtrictly and abſtractly conſidered, and our glorifying GOD and enjoying him, being diſtinct, though inſeperable Things in themſelves, he ſhould have told, which of them is ſubordinate to the other.

PROPOSITION ſeventh he lays down, is, *pag*: 138. *That though GOD can promote his own Glory*, (which is his Chief End) *by the Eternal Miſery of ſome Rational Creatures*; *yet he cannot propoſe to them, nor require of them, that they ſhould love, ſeek, and deſire as their Chief End, any Thing elſe, than that wherein their own Chief Happineſs conſiſts*, &c. But Mr. *Simſon* ſuppoſeth, That Mr. *Webſter* maintains, That Men ſhould ſeek the glorifying GOD, were it by their own Damnation, which indeed is a groſs and abſurd Opinion; but I ſuppoſe hardly any maintain this, and Mr. *Simſon* without Ground chargeth it upon Mr. *Webſter*.

AND further he lays down three Propoſitions, *pag*: 140. 1*ſt*. *That our active glorifying GOD, is the End of our Life and Actions here on Earth*. 2dly. *That the End of our active glorifying him, is, our full enjoying, and glorifying him for ever in Heaven, which is our laſt End, which on no Account we can be obliged to part with*. 3dly. *The ultimate End of both theſe, is, The Glory of GOD's infinite Mercy, and other Attributes glorified by Man's Salvation*.

BUT *firſt*, he makes our active glorifying GOD the End of our Life and Actions, here on Earth; but why does he not make the enjoying GOD on Earth alſo, the End of our Life; ſince he is to be en-

enjoyed, as well as glorified upon Earth. 2*dly*. He ſeems to reſtrain glorifying GOD, in the *Catechiſm*, to glorifying him upon Earth, which is ſtrange: For ought not glorifying him in Heaven to be our End alſo. 3*dly*. I do not ſo well underſtand the ſecond *Propoſition*: For he either make the enjoying and glorifying GOD in Heaven, one complex ultimate End of Man: But tho' ſpeaking largely they make up Man's chief End, yet ſpeaking ſtrictly, they are diſtinct things, and ſo diſtinct Ends, even as GOD's Glory and Man's Salvation are diſtinct things: And therefore ſhould have told, which of theſe two was ſubordinate to the other, as our ultimate End.

As to his third *Propoſition*, the Queſtion is not concerning GOD's own ultimate End; but Man's ultimate End, which he is ultimately to intend: But as to this laſt, he tells us not diſtinctly, whether it is our active glorifying him for ever, or our own Happineſs and Pleaſure in the Enjoying GOD; but ſhifts this by telling us, that the ultimate End of glorifying GOD here, and our enjoying and glorifying hereafter, is the Glory of GOD's Infinite Mercy, and other Attributes.

We ſhall next ſet down his Judgment on this Head, *firſt*, We may gather this, from his ſecond *Propoſition*, *Pag*: 135. Where he ſays, *A Rational Creature cannot love any thing* (and ſo GOD) *but as it's good and pleaſant to it*. 2*dly*. From *Pag*: 140. Where he calls glorifying GOD on Earth the ſubordinate Mean, and Man's Happineſs in the Enjoyment of GOD his ultimate End. 3*dly*. From *Pag*: 143. Where he labours to prove this. 4*ly*. *Pag*: 145. he calls it, *A vain Imagination, and* Antino-

inomianism, *to fancy, that any can love GOD, or any other Person or thing, but under the Notion of good to them.* 5*thly. Pag:* 152. he says, *It's suitable to GOD's Goodness, and the Scriptures, that GOD should create a World of intelligent Beings, of such a Make, as to seek their own great Happiness, as the chief End of their Actions.* I think he speaks pretty plainly here. 6*thly.* From *Pag:* 153. Where he says, *It's like Mr.* Webster *never heard of any Divine, who made Love to their own Happiness, more than to GOD's Glory, an essential Ingredient in good Works*: But says, *Did he never read or hear, that our glorifying GOD here on Earth, by Faith and good Works, is a necessary Mean for obtaining the gracious Reward, of Eternal Happiness in the full enjoying of GOD*, &c. From which we see how he owns Mr. *Webster*'s Question.

WE shall premise some Considerations, and then examine Mr. *Simson*'s Opinion upon this Head. *First*, Any may judge, from what he owns and asserts here, if he does not plainly justifie Mr. *Webster*'s Libel upon this Head. 2*dly.* He unnecessarly separates GOD's End, and Man's ultimate End, as if they were not the same: For he makes GOD's End the glorifying his Attributes; and Man's ultimate End, his own Happiness in the full enjoying of GOD; whereas Man's last End, and Aim should coincide with GOD's End, *viz:* the glorifying of GOD. 3*dly.* He supposeth, That if the glorifying GOD be Man's ultimate End; that therefore it must be Man's ultimate End, in that full Extent and Manner, in which GOD intends to glorifie himself, *viz:* to glorifie GOD, were it in his own Damnation, and

loss

loſs of Salvation, which is indeed an harſh Opinion and impoſſible: For GOD cannot indeed bind Man to any thing, by Way of Duty, that is deſtructive of his Happineſs, and includes a State of ſinning. *4thly.* He ſeems not to diſtinguiſh ſufficiently betwixt Man's ultimate End, conſidered *ex parte Creantis, et Cauſæ efficientis*; whether the Creature intend this End or not, be active or paſſive in advancing this End: Thus the ultimate End of Angels and Men, for which they are deſigned, is the glorifying of his Mercy upon ſome; and of his Juſtice upon others, abſtract from whatever they may either do, or intend, *Rom*: 9. 22, 23. and *Rev*: 4. 9. *Eph*: 2. 6, 7. *For thy Glory they are and were created*: And betwixt Man's ultimate End, laid on him *per modum Officii*, or by Way of Duty; thus Man's ultimate End, he ſhould intend, is the glorifying GOD's rich Grace and Mercy in ſerving him here, and enjoying and ſerving him perfectly in Heaven. *5ly.* He ſuppoſeth, That becauſe we cannot intend the glorifying GOD, without a View to our own eternal Happineſs; that therefore our own Happineſs, in the eternal Enjoyment of GOD for ever, muſt be Man's ultimate End: But *firſt*, Two things may be inſeparably linked together, when yet the one is neceſſarly ſubordinated to the other, as is our ſerving and enjoying GOD, to the glorifying of him; ſee 1 *Pet:* 2. 9. *2dly.* It is falſe; for a Man may be ſo ſwallowed up with a View and Deſire to glorify GOD, as in the mean Time, he thinks not upon, nor hath any View to his own perſonal Happineſs, as Believers find this in many Inſtances in themſelves; for though

out

ur glorifying GOD, and our Happineſs, be nſeparably linked together; yet being diſtinct hings, a Believer may ſome times intend the one, o as his Thoughts in the mean time, are abſtra-ted from the other. *6thly.* He ſeems not to di-inguiſh betwixt what ſtands in Room of a Mo-ive to ſuch an End, and betwixt the End it ſelf, hich is ſuch, both according to the natural Or-er of things, and alſo by Vertue of a Command: nd therefore becauſe our Happineſs in the eter-al Enjoyment of GOD, is and ought to be a reat Motive, to our ſeeking to glorify GOD: herefore he infers, That our own Happineſs, in he Enjoyment of GOD, ſhould be our ultimate nd; for ſome times the Excellency of the Mean s a Motive to purſue the End; and again the reatneſs of the End is a Motive to the Uſe of the eans, in Order to attain the End it ſelf, as it's n this Caſe. Now we are to judge of the laſt nd, by the natural Order of Things, and by the ommand, enjoyning us to make this our laſt End. *7thly.* We are to diſtinguiſh betwixt GOD's be-ng our laſt End, as it denotes our perſonal Satis-action and Happineſs, in the Enjoyment of him-elf; and as it denotes our bringing in a Tribute f Praiſe to him, in our active glorifying him. It's rue, theſe are inſeparable, and he that truly in-ends the one, intends the other; yet are they di-inct Conſiderations. *8thly.* Glorifying GOD in eaven, may be conſidered two Ways. *1ſt. Per odum Finis,* and in Point of Duty, it's the ulti-ate End, we ſhould propoſe to our ſelves, *viz:* he glorifying him, or the active ſhewing forth of is Grace and Love. Or, *2dly. Per modum Privi-*

legii

legii, as it's our great Honour and Happineſs, to be thus glorifying him. Now the laſt, conſidering the Nature of the things themſelves, is plainly ſubordinate to the firſt.

NOW though he does not expreſs his Judgment upon this Head ſo diſtinctly, as were to be wiſhed; yet his Mind is eaſily gathered, from the Paſſages in his Defences we took notice of: For he ſays, *It's ſuitable to GOD's Wiſdom and Goodneſs, to make Intelligent Beings of ſuch a Make, as to ſeek their own great Happineſs as the Ultimate End of their Actions*; from which it's plain he owns, that Happineſs in the Enjoyment of GOD is Man's Ultimate End, & not the glorifying GOD, in the enjoyment of him; for he calls it a Fancy that any can love GOD, but as he is good to them.

BUT that not Man's own Happineſs, in the Enjoyment of GOD, is his Ultimate and Chief End (though it cannot, but alſo be his great and ſecond End) but his active glorifying GOD, in the ſerving and enjoying him, is plain from Scripture, where the glorifying GOD here, and hereafter is held forth as the Ultimate End, they are to purſue, ſee 1 *Cor.* 10. 31. 1 *Cor.* 6. 20. 1 *Pet.* 2. 9. where the End of their Effectual Calling is ſaid to be, *That they may ſhew forth the Praiſes of him that hath done ſo*, See 1 Pet. 4. 11. Iſaiah 43. 21. *This People have I formed for my ſelf, they ſhall ſhew forth my Praiſe.* See alſo *Pſalm* 22. 25, 26. 2*dly*. What is GOD's great End, in electing and redeeming his People, ought to be their Ultimate End, they ſhould propoſe to themſelves; but the ſhewing forth the Praiſe of his great Love, and glorious rich Grace, was the End of his elect-

lecting and redeeming them, *Rom.* 9. 23, 24. *Eph.* 1. 6, 12. *Eph:* 2. 6, 7, 8. *That in the Ages to come, he might ſhew forth,* &c. Now this is a great Part of our Conformity to GOD, to have the ſame Ultimate End that he hath; and eſpecially where the propoſing this as our Ultimate End, is laid upon us as our grand Duty, *Iſa.* 43. 2. 3*dly*. What was Chriſt's great End upon Earth in carrying on the Work of Redemption, and wherein he propoſeth himſelf as a Patern for our Imitation ſhould be our great End: For it's a great Branch of our Conformity to him, to have the ſame laſt end, with him, where he propoſeth himſelf as a Patern to us; but his great and ultimate end in all he did and ſuffered, was the advancing of the Glory of him that ſent him, and from this he proves the Truth of his Miſſion, *Joh.* 8. 4*thly*. What is their great Work and Buſineſs in Heaven, muſt certainly be Believers Ultimate End; but their great Work in Heaven is, to trumpet forth the Praiſe of his glorious, and rich Grace, ſhining forth, in their Salvation. 5*thly*. Man ſtands in a ſubordination to GOD, as to his Being, and therefore muſt needs ſtand in a ſubordination to GOD, as his laſt End, *viz.* by way of Duty: Now this muſt either be as Man's own Happineſs, in the Enjoyment of GOD as his ultimate End, but in that caſe Man is his own laſt End, and ſo his own God, for the enjoyment of GOD, in that caſe, is chiefly ſought, that the Man may be happy therein, and ſo it's himſelf he ultimately ſeeks and deſigns in the Enjoyment of GOD; ſo that the Enjoyment of GOD is not ultimately ſought, but himſelf, or

his own Happineſs therein; or it muſt be, as the glorifying GOD, in the enjoyment of him, is our laſt end; and this is agreeable to Scripture, but what Mr. *Simſon* oppoſeth.

6. To make this our ultimate end, is to love GOD, only and chiefly as he is good to us, this Mr. *Simſon* expreſly affirms, and calls the affirming the contrary, *Antinomian Myſticks*, as we ſhewed; But this is plainly very groſs, for this is to love God only for our ſelves, and ſo to love our ſelves more than GOD, for when a Man loves a Thing only and chiefly, for the ſake of another, he certainly loves that other Thing moſt; ſo if a Man can only love GOD as he is good to him, he certainly loves himſelf more than GOD, which is very groſs, and contrary to the firſt Command, which requires, that we love the Lord, with all our Soul, Strength, *&c.* which ſays we are to love him ſuperlatively, *i. e.* above all Things elſe, and ſo, above our ſelves; otherwiſe we do not love him, with all our Strength, Soul, *&c.* if we love our ſelves more than GOD, as we do, if we love him only as he is good to us, for, this is to love GOD, only for our own ſakes.

To this Argument Mr. *Simſon* anſwers, *Pag:* 144. 1ſt. *That none can in Reaſon ſay, that theſe Words require us to love GOD, above our Eternal Happineſs in the enjoyment of him.* 2dly. He ſays, *That the Command requiring us to give our chief Love to GOD, plainly intimates that he muſt needs be our chief Good, greateſt Happineſs,* &c. *And therefore GOD to aſſure his People hereof, and move them to this Love, declares himſelf to be their chief good in the Preface to the Ten Commands:* and *if this be*

to

to love our ſelves more than GOD (which he thinks it is not) he ſays, *it is no more than what the Sum of the Ten Commands obligeth us to*, &c.

But *Firſt*, If we are to love GOD only as he is good to us, and makes us eternally Happy, then it's obvious, we love him not for himſelf, but for the ſake of our Eternal Happineſs, and conſequently do not love him with all the Heart, if we love him only for the ſake of our own Happineſs. 2*dly*. We do not love GOD with all our Heart, Soul, &c. unleſs we love him chiefly for himſelf, *i. e.* his own Eſſential Excellency and Perfection, though we are to love him alſo as he is good to us. 3*dly*. Though the Command to give our chief Love to GOD, does neceſſarly imply that he is our chief Happineſs, it follows not that we are to love him only as he is good to us, as is plain. For this ſuppoſeth that he is, firſt infinitely good, and excellent in himſelf, ere he is good to us, and our Love this way ſhould act according to the Natural Order of the Things themſelves.

Page 145. He calls it *Myſticks and a Fancy* to ſay, *That any can love GOD, but under the Notion as he is good to them*: Now if this be not groſs, any may judge; for ſo none can love GOD for himſelf, *i. e.* for his own glorious Perfections, conſidered in themſelves. 2*dly*. So Men love themſelves chiefly, and in the firſt place before GOD, for they love him only as he is good to them, and ſo muſt needs love themſelves in the firſt Place.

He ſays, *That when a Servant ſerves his Maſter chearfully, more from reſpect to his Maſter's Ho-*

nour, and Commands, than from love to the Wages, or fear of the Whip; it's evident, that this Servant does ſo, becauſe his Maſter's Honour, and Obedience to his Commands, are a greater good to him than his Wages, &c. But even in that caſe, the Servant loves his own good, more than his Maſter's Honour, or Commands; for according to Mr. *Simſon*'s Gloſs, the Servant loves his Maſter's Honour, becauſe he apprehends, it's a greater good to him than his Wages, and ſo muſt love his own good, and conſequently himſelf, more than his Maſter's Honour, and ſo if the Parallel hold, a Man loves GOD's Service, becauſe it's a greater good to him: So that Men ſtill love themſelves, and their own good in the firſt place, before GOD; for their Love to GOD is ſtill Relative, and for the ſake of *Self*. 2*dly*. Is it not evident from frequent Experience, that a Servant may ſerve his Maſter out of pure Love to his Maſter, without any view to that, whether his Maſter's Honour, be a greater, or leſs good to him? And do not Believers ſeveral Duties, with a pure view to GOD's Glory, without any Conſideration in the mean Time, of their Advantage that neceſſarly follows upon that Service. It ſeems Profeſſor *Simſon* allows of no Love either to GOD, or Man, but what hath it's Original from a prior reſpect to *Self*; ſo that love to *Self* is the Root both of Love to GOD, and our Neighbour; this plainly makes a Man to love himſelf in the firſt Place, and GOD for the ſake of himſelf, which ſeems ſtrange and groſs, for ſo he loves himſelf more than GOD.

7. I add further, That what is our ultimate and

and laſt End here upon Earth, muſt certainly much more be ſo, in Heaven (for we never fully come up to our laſt End, while here) unleſs Mr. *Simſon* think that we have one ultimate End here, and another, when in Heaven; but Mr. *Simſon* owns, That Man's ultimate End here is the glorifying of GOD, and it's alſo plain from the *Catechiſm*, where Man's chief End is ſaid, *to be to glorifie GOD*, &c. Now to reſtrain this glorifying GOD to the Time here upon Earth, is plainly groſs, for this is to make Man have one ultimate End here, and another in Heaven; beſides, glorifying GOD and enjoying him, muſt either be coordinate Ends, which is a Thing cannot be, for Man cannot have two coordinate ultimate Ends, more than two Supream Principles of his Being, or they muſt be ſubordinate; and if ſo, either the glorifying of GOD, muſt be a ſubordinate End to our Happineſs, which I would think groſs enough; or our Happineſs muſt be ſubordinate to our glorifying him, which is agreeable to Scripture; but what Profeſſor *Simſon* plainly denies.

8. We further argue thus, What is the ultimate End of particular Deliverances Believers get here upon Earth, muſt be much more the ultimate End of their compleat Deliverance and Salvation in Heaven, but the ultimate End of all their Deliverances here upon Earth, whether Temporal or Spiritual is, That they may glorifie GOD: As is plain from *Pſal:* 50. *I will deliver thee, and thou ſhall glorifie me.* 1. Pet: 2. 9. Pſal: 142. 7. *Bring my Soul out of Priſon*, That I may praiſe, &c.

Laſtly

LASTLY, If Love to our own Happineſs be the chief Motive of our Love to GOD, then the chief Motive of Hatred againſt Sin, and Sorrow for it, muſt be not the Diſhonour done thereby to GOD, but our own Ruine and Miſery, Sin brings upon us, which is contrary to Scripture, and all ſound Divinity.

AS to the Inſtances he brings, *1ſt.* Of the Bleſſed Redeemer. *Heb.* 12.2. *Who for the Joy that was ſet before him* &c. *2dly*: Of *Abraham*, and other Saints. *Heb.* 11. *Who looked for an heavenly Country* &c. And, *3ly. Paul* Phil. 3. 14. *&c.* They do not at all prove, That they propoſed their own Happineſs, as their laſt ultimate End, ſo as their glorifying GOD was ſubordinate thereto: They prove indeed, That they had their own eternal Happineſs, in View, as a great Motive to Obedience and Suffering, but proves not, That they had no further View, than their own perſonal eternal Happineſs in the Enjoyment of GOD, *viz.* their eternal and active glorifying of him, in the Enjoyment of himſelf, which is certainly the natural Order of the Things themſelves: He challenges to produce the Example of one Saint to the contrary; but was not this the great End in all that Chriſt did and ſuffered here, did he not ſeek ultimatly the Glory of him that ſent him, if it was his ultimate End here; ſhould it not much more be our ultimate and laſt End, and is not the Saints ſerving and glorifying GOD in Heaven, held forth as their great Work there, and therefore muſt be their ultimate End.

FURTHER, though our glorifying GOD, and our own Happineſs, can never be ſeparated, it follows

ollows not, that the laſt is not in Order of Nature ſubordinated to the firſt: For, all Rewards oblige to a further End, *viz.* The thanking and praiſing the Giver; and therefore, our eternal Happineſs being a Reward, and being propoſed as ſuch, will oblige Believers in Heaven, to an eternal Tribute of Praiſe; ſo their glorifying GOD in Heaven muſt be their ultimate End, for a Man can be obliged to Nothing beyond his laſt End. It's true indeed, That without a Proſpect to our own Happineſs, we cannot ſerve GOD, but it's Wilde from thence to infer that Man's own Happineſs is his ultimate End, to which his glorifying GOD, whether upon Earth or in Heaven, ſtands ſubordinate: Beſides, That in many Inſtances a Believer may purely intend GOD's Glory, without any View in the mean Time to his own perſonal Happineſs. In a Word when he ſays, That without a Proſpect to his own Happineſs, he could not, and ſo would not ſerve GOD: I conceive it to be a Way of ſpeaking harſh, and offenſive to Chriſtian Ears.

PAG: 142, 143. He ſays, *That if Mr.* Webſter's *Meaning be, That we are to prefer the Glory of GOD to our Chief happineſs and ſatisfying Pleaſure in the Eternal enjoying and glorifying Him in Heaven, and be denyed to this, and willing for ever to Part with it, if GOD's Glory ſhould require it, &c.* Then he ſays, *He is not of his Mind, &c.* But he without any ground ſuppoſeth, this to be Mr. *Webſter's* Judgment, for indeed it's an abſurd Opinion, and GOD no where requires it of us. 2*dly.* He ſays, That when we place our Chief happineſs and moſt ſatisfying

tisfying Delight, in beholding and admiring the Glory of GOD's, moſt excellent Perfections, and being made like him in Holineſs and Glory, and in enjoying the raviſhing Pleaſures of Proclaiming his Praiſes to all Eternity; And that when we propoſe this as our chiefeſt End and greateſt Happineſs, that we do then moſt effectually Glorify him: But 1*ſt*. Since our enjoying GOD in Heaven, and glorifying Him there, are diſtinct, though really inſeparable things, he lets us not know, which of them ſtand in Subordination one to the other, this he ſeems to wave: Holineſs here, and Happineſs hereafter, are diſtinct, though inſeparable Ends; yet the firſt is ſubordinate to the laſt, and yet we can never be obliged to part with the firſt more than the laſt. 2*dly*. He ſeems to make Proclaiming GOD's Praiſes in Heaven Man's ultimate End, not as it reſpects GOD, and is a Tribute payed to him, but as its attended with raviſhing Pleaſures; ſo that the Man's own Pleaſure is a Superior End, for which he makes the Proclaiming GOD's Praiſes his end; and conſequently the glorifying GOD in Heaven, is not the ultimate End, he intends, but the raviſhing Pleaſure he enjoys therein, whereby the glorifying GOD in Heaven is ſubordinated to Man's own raviſhing Pleaſure as his ultimate End, which indeed is to make Man his own laſt End, and ſo his own God. 3*dly*. If this be to glorifie GOD, when we deſign the glorifying Him for our own ſakes, as it gives us raviſhing Pleaſure, and not upon the account of His Eternal and Infinite Excellency, and as it's a Tribute due, upon that account any may Judge. 4*thly*. The Queſtion is not, whether we

can

can be obliged to part with enjoying GOD and the pleaſure that flows therefrom; but whether this be an End we are to Purſue in a ſubordination, to our active Glorifying him in Heaven, but this ſtate of the Queſtion he ſeems to wave. *5tbly.* If he mean that it's not conſiſtent with GOD's Nature or ours, to propoſe to us an higher End, than our ſeeking to Glorifie Him in Heaven, as being that which bring in raviſhing pleaſures to us, this is groſs, for it's to ſay, GOD cannot propoſe an higher End to us, than our own happineſs, and our ſelves, as our ultimate End; for ſo GOD's Glory is not our End, as it terminates one GOD, but on our ſelves by it's yeilding us raviſhing Pleaſures.

3. He adduceth 1 *Joh:* 3. 2, 3. *When he ſhall appear, we ſhall be like him, &c.* But 1*ſt.* this does not prove, that perfect Conformity to Him is our ultimate End, though it be certainly one great branch of our Happineſs. For, 2*dly.* What is the ultimate End of our begun Conformity to GOD, muſt much more be the ultimate End of our perfect Conformity to him in Heaven, but our active glorifying GOD, is the ultimate End of a begun likeneſs to him here, 1 *Pet:* 2. 9. And therefore muſt be the ultimate End of Compleat Likeneſs to Him in Heaven. For, 3*dly.* The End of all Habits is Action; Now perfect Conformity to GOD in Heaven, being like an Habit, and the end of Habits being to Qualifie for action, the End of perfect Likeneſs to GOD, muſt be to qualify them for Praiſing and Glorifying GOD; therefore it's held furth as their great and laſt Work in Heaven, *Rev.* 5. 9, 10, 11, *&c.*

A Second Scripture he adduceth is, *Rom:* 2. 7. Where he ſays, *Pag:* 144. That our Eternal Happineſs in the Enjoyment of GOD, is through the whole Scripture held furth, as the chief Motive of ourLove and Obedience, and tells there cannot be an higher. Now, 1*ſt.* If this be not the ſame with the Propoſition lybelled, which he ſays, Is not a true account of his Opinion, we leave to any to judge, who will compare it, with thir Words of his. 2*dly.* Though Eternal Life be promiſed as a Reward, it follows not that it's the great End we ſhould propoſe to our ſelves; for Praiſing the Giver, is the End of the Reward. 3*dly:* If our own Happineſs in the enjoyment of GOD, be the chief Motive of our Love and Obedience; And if there cannot be an higher Motive, then 1*ſt.* Reſpect to our ſelves is the chief Motive of our Love to GOD, ſo that we are chiefly to Love GOD for our own ſakes, and conſequently we are to Love our ſelves in the firſt place, and GOD only in the ſecond place, as he makes us happy. 2*dly.* Then we are to Love GOD Chiefly, for His Goodneſs to us, and not for Himſelf, and his abſolute Perfection and Excellency, if this be not ſtrange Doctrine, I know not what is ſuch.

He ſays further, *Pag:* 146, *That the LORD CHRIST could not be obliged to prefer GOD's Glory to His own greateſt Happineſs, by undergoing Sufferings to Eternity?* But this is not to the Purpoſe; for it's true he could not be obliged to this; yet two things may in order of Nature be ſubordinate the one to the other when yet the things are inſeparable in the as were GOD's Glory, and th

the Happineſs of the Mediator; Holineſs here, is a ſubordinate End to our Happineſs hereafter, yet we cannot be obliged to part with Holineſs here, though our Happineſs in Heaven be a Superior End.

Although it be hard to determine the particular Meaning of theſe places, anent the Wiſh of *Moſes* and *Paul*, *Exod.* 32. 32. *Rom:* 9. 3. yet I think it plain enough, that they had a greater Regard to GOD's Honour, than their own Happineſs, though they could not be obliged to part with their own Eternal Happineſs; May not a Servant prefer his Maſters Service to his Meat and Drink, and yet he can never be obliged to want Meat and Drink altogether?

Again *Pag:* 154. He ſays, *That Men muſt have the greateſt Regard to what they conceive to be the greateſt Good to them, whether in it ſelf, or with reſpect to another, it be the greateſt Good or not; and ſo muſt have the greateſt regard to the Enjoyment of GOD, in which Believers know their greateſt Good lyes.* But if ſo, then they are to have a greater regard to their own Good, than to GOD's Glory; for it ſeems they are chiefly to ſeek the Enjoyment of GOD in Heaven, as it is good, and brings in Pleaſure to them, more than as it qualifies them actively to Glorify GOD.

He cites 1*ſt*. Mr. *Firmin*'s *Real Chriſtian* as making for his Opinion: But *firſt*, He names no particular Place in that Book. 2*dly*. I have ſeen and read that Book, and there Mr *Firmin* only refutes the Opinion of Mr. *Roger*'s and Mr *Shepherd*, 1*ſt*. That Men are to eye only the Glory of free Grace in their believing, without any

any view at all to their own Salvation. 2*dly*. That in believing they are to be ſo denyed to their own Salvation, as to ſubmit to the loſs of it, if it be for GOD's Glory, which indeed are ſtrange Doctrines: But Mr. *Simſon* may know very well that a Man may ſeek his own Salvation in a ſubordination to his glorifying of GOD therein, when yet he is by no means to diſpenſe with the ſeeking his own Salvation; for two Things may be ſubordinate the one to the other, and yet be inſeparable, even as Holineſs here is ſubordinate to our Eternal Salvation in Heaven, and yet the one is inſeparable from the other; and Mr. *Firmine* expreſly ſays, That the great Work of Believers in Heaven, when perfectly poſſeſs'd of Salvation, will be their eternal glorifying of GOD; and conſequently they have a Work and End beyond their own Salvation, though ſtill inſeparable from it, *viz*. their eternal glorifying GOD.

NEXT he names *Joan*: *Crocius* upon *Eph*: 1. 4. *Ut ſimus ſancti, et inculpati*, &c. *Alibi ſalutem ut Finem Electionis nominat*, 2 Theſ: 2: 13. *Hoc capite Gloriam DEI nominat, at hic Finem ex parte noſtra, iſti ſubordinatum exprimit, quod non eſt alienum, Gloria DEI eſt abſolute ſummus* Finis; *ex parte noſtra ſummus, eſt Salus, ſubordinatus, eſt Sanctitas*. But any Body may ſee, how that Place makes directly againſt him: For 1*ſt*: *Crocius* ſays, That the Glory of GOD is ſaid elſe where, to be the End of Election. 2*dly*. He ſays, That he ſpeaks of Salvation, as the End on our Part, ſubordinate to that, *i*: *e*. the glorifying of GOD; and conſequently it's our Duty, to ſeek Salvation in a Sub-

Subordination to the glorifying of GOD. 3*dly*. He ſays, The glorifying GOD is abſolutely the chief End, on our Part, the chief End is our own Salvation, and the ſubordinate End to that, is Holineſs; from which Words it appears, that there are two great Ends, we are to purſue, *Firſt*, One ultimate End with Reference to GOD, *viz*. the glorifying of him, this he calls, Abſolutely the laſt End. 2*dly*. Another chief End, with Reference to our ſelves, *viz*. our own Salvation, and this End, he ſays, is on our Part ſubordinate to that, *viz*. the glorifying of GOD: So that this Teſtimony makes againſt him. 3*dly*. He cites Doctor *Owen* his *Treatiſe on the Sabbath, Exercit*: 3. §: 8. *Where the Enjoyment of GOD in Glory, is ſaid to be the ultimate End as to us, of our Creation*: But any may ſee, how little this makes to his Purpoſe: For every Body will own there is a twofold End, we are to purſue: 1*ſt*. With Reference to GOD, *viz*: his Glory. 2*dly*. With Reference to our ſelves, and that is without all doubt, our own Salvation; ſo that while Mr: *Owen* calls, *Salvation the ultimate End, as to us*; he ſuppoſeth there is another ultimate End with Reference to GOD, which we are to purſue, *viz*: the Glory of GOD, to which the other, in the Order of Nature, plainly ſtands ſubordinate.

I ſhall adduce a Teſtimony out of the Reverend Principal *Wiſheart*'s Sermons, ſee *Pag*: 496 *Vol*: 2. The words are, *You make your ſelf your End in the Internal Acts of Religion, when in your Deſires after Heaven you aim only at your own Happineſs; when you make this the ultimate End of your Deſires, this is to reſpect* Self, *more than GOD. We ſhould aim*

aim at the Glory of GOD in our Salvation; ſo that his Glory ſhould be our chief and ultimate End: But when you aim only at your own Happineſs, this is a Motion of meer Nature: And a little below in the ſame Section, where granting, that Regard to our Happineſs ſhould influence us, to ſerve the LORD, he has theſe Words, *Yet this Reſpect muſt be contained in its due Bounds, in a due Subordination to the Glory of GOD, not above it, nor in an equal Ballance with it; but when in your Deſires after ſuch ſpiritual Bleſſings, your Thoughts of GOD's Glory and Honour, are over-topped, by Aims at your own Advantage; this is to make* Self *your End.* See alſo *Pag:* 233. *Vol:* 1. where he ſpeaks to the ſame Purpoſe; and *Pag.* 313: of that firſt Volum, where he ſpeaks, both of GOD's abſolute and relative Goodneſs, as Grounds of Prayer; ſo that GOD is to be loved for his abſolute Goodneſs, as well as his relative Goodneſs: See alſo *Pag:* 602: of the 2 *Vol:*

TO Conclude this Head, here are two Extreams to be ſhunned, *Firſt*, That we are to intend GOD's Glory; ſo as, we be willing to diſpence with our own Happineſs, or have no view thereto: This is a dangerous Extream, and what GOD never calls any to: The other Extream is, That we are to prefer our Happineſs in the enjoying GOD, to our active glorifying of him; ſo as to make the laſt a ſubordinate End to the firſt, and ſo as we are to love GOD, not as he is infinitely glorious, and excellent in himſelf; but only as he is good to us, the firſt depreſſeth ſelf Happineſs too much, the laſt exalteth it too much, even above GOD's Glory, which is Mr. *Simſon*'s Opinion, and makes

Man his own Ultimate End, and not GOD, &c. The third and safe is the middle Way, that inseperably joins our glorifying GOD, and enjoying him together, yet so as the last is naturally subordinate to the first, both in the Nature of the Thing, and in Point of Duty on our Part.

CHAP. VI.

Concerning the Covenant of Works.

THE Propositions libelled upon this Head, are three, 1*st. That there was no proper Covenant, made betwixt GOD and* Adam *in Innocency.*

2. THAT Adam *was not a proper Federal Representative, or Head of all Mankind.*

3. THAT *there is not a formal Imputation of* Adam's *first Sin to his Posterity, only such an Imputation, as is often of our immediate Parents Sins to us,* i. e. *His punishing us for the Faults of our Fathers, though we do not sin in them.*

ERE he answer to these three Propositions, he says, He must first answer to some Thing falsely charged on him by Mr. *Webster*, as 1*st. That he denyes the* 2. Parag: *of the* 7. Chap: *of the* Confession of Faith. As also, That he denyes the Answer to that Question in the *Larger Catechism, Did all Mankind fall with* Adam *in his first Transgression?* Both which he says, he holds and teaches.

BUT *first.* If he pervert the Sense of them, 'tis no great Matter, though he hold and teach the Words. 2*dly.* We will have Occasion to observe afterwards, how discreetly he treats the

Confes-

Confeſſion of Faith? 3*dly*. He ſays, He calls not Mr. *Webſter*'s Accuſation falſe, when he alleadges (though without any Shadow of Reaſon) that his Opinion is contrary to theſe Paſſages of the *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſm*, &c. Now if it be not a falſe Accuſation, then it hath ſome Shadow of Reaſon. 2*dly*. He refuſes as falſe, That he boldly libels the *Weſtminſter* Divines, for contradicting themſelves; as alſo he denies, That he affirms, that the *Catechiſm's* Account of the *Covenant* differs from the *Confeſſion of Faith*: *First*, becauſe the *Covenant of Works*, is neither in the *Confeſſion* or *Catechiſm*, called a Covenant in the proper and ſtrict Senſe of Lawyers, as a Covenant is oppoſed to a Law. 2*dly*. Becauſe the Word *Covenant*, is in Scripture uſed for an improper Covenant. 3*dly*. Becauſe the Deſcription of the Covenant, of Works *Chap*: 7. of the *Confeſſion of Faith*, *Par*: 2. agrees to a Law, and hath the ſame Senſe, as if it were ſaid the *Law of Works*; ſo that if the Word *Law*, be put for *Covenant*, with a ſuitable Change of the Particles, the Senſe will be the ſame. And thus he ſays, The Scripture Proofs will agree to the Thing proved, and not otherwiſe; for all of them have the Word *Law*.

BUT 1*ſt*. Whether he libels the *Weſtminſter* Divines, we ſhall have Occaſion within a little to conſider. 2*dly*. Neither is the *Covenant of Grace* in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, called a proper and ſtrict Covenant; will it follow, therefore it's not a proper Covenant: Yea, we read of no Covenant in Scripture, that is called a proper Covenant. Will it therefore follow, That there is not a proper Covenant in all the Scripture?

Does

Does not the *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms* deſcribe the *Covenant of Works*, So as any may ſee, they make it a proper Covenant, while it's ſaid, *That GOD entered into a Covenant with Man:* Is it not the very ſame Expreſſion that is uſed in Scripture, where if a proper Covenant be pointed out, it's certainly there, as in *Aſa*'s Time? 2. *Chron:* 15. It's ſaid they entered into a Covenant and *Jer:* 34. Where when agreeing to diſmiſs their Servants, we have the ſame Expreſſion, *&c.* I conceive it is a pretty bold Perverſion of the Words to ſay, That a Covenant is here taken only improperly; this opens a wide Door to Men of corrupt Principles, to make a Noſe of Wax of the *Confeſſion of Faith*: May not a *Socinian* ſay, CHRIST is not a proper Propitiation for Sins; becauſe the Scripture doth not call him ſo? 2*dly*. It's true that the Word *Covenant*, is ſometimes in Scripture taken for an improper Covenant; But will it follow, that it's ſo taken when applyed to the *Covenant of Works*? May not one ſay ſo alſo of the *Covenant of Grace*? I would know what is in the Deſcription of the *Covenant of Grace*, that makes it be a proper Covenant, that is not in the Deſcription of the *Covenant of Works*? I ſuppoſe he will hardly find the Word *Covenant*, when uſed for a Covenant betwixt GOD and Man, taken for an improper Covenant: Indeed it is ſo, when applyed to other Creatures, as at the Flood, *Gen:* 9. 2*dly*. If the Deſcription of the *Covenant of Works*, *Chap:* 7. §. 2. agrees to what is a Law in Contradiſtinction to a Covenant it's ſtrange: For, does not the firſt *Parag:* of that Chapter

tell, That the Diſtance betwixt GOD and the Creature is ſo great, that although the reaſonable Creature owe Obedience to him, as a Creator, yet they could never have any Fruition of him as their Bleſſedneſs, but by ſome voluntary Condeſcenſion on his Part, which he hath been pleaſed to expreſs by Way of Covenant; from which it's plain, That a Covenant here is a Thing diſtinct from a Law, proceeding from him, conſidered only as a Creator. Is not this Covenant ſaid to have been made with Man; and in the *Catechiſms*, to have been entred into with Man? Now it were an harſh Way of ſpeaking, to ſay, That GOD made, or entred into a Law with Man: And Mr. *Simſon* is ſenſible of this, when he would have the Terms altered; from which it's plain he is diſpleaſed with the Terms and Expreſſions in the *Confeſſion of Faith*; and ſo cenſures the *Weſtminſter* Divines, as not uſing fit Terms: I could wiſh he had named the Particles he would have changed with thoſe he would have put in their Room, and we might the better have underſtood his Meaning. 3*dly*. Where there is a Propoſal of a Reward on GOD's Part, with a Propoſal of a Condition to be performed by Man, ſure it is a Propoſal of a proper Covenant on GOD's Part; as is here, and Man's Acceptance required and given, make it a compleat Covenant; but GOD's making a Covenant with Man, neceſſarly implyes Man's Acceptance; as is plain; for making a Covenant with any implies the mutual Conſent of both Parties.

4. IT's no Argument to prove, it is a Law and not a proper Covenant, becauſe the Word

Law

Law is uſed in the Scriptures adduced for Proof in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, for it's the thing meaned by a proper Covenant we ſpeak of; And if the places where the Word *Law* is uſed, Point out a proper Covenant, it is not Material, as it is certain they do, as for the Reaſons, why it is ſo frequently called a Law, we may have occaſion to hint at them afterwards. It ſeems the *Weſtminſter* Divines have brought irrelevant Proofs to prove a proper Covenant; for he ſays, unleſs Covenant be taken for a proper Law, the Scriptures adduced does not prove it.

HE ſays, *Pag.* 159. That theſe Words in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, *Chap*: 6. § 1. (*They*, viz. Adam and Eve, *being the Root of all Mankind, the Guilt of their Sin is imputed, &c.*) do found the Imputation of their Sin to their Poſterity, upon the natural Relation (to which Mr. *Simſon* ſays, he perfectly agrees) and not on the Federal. 2*dly*. He grants, that the *Catechiſms* ſeems to fix it upon the Federal Relation, if the Word *Covenant* be taken in the ſtrict Senſe, and ſo grants that they will differ from the *Confeſſion*; And ſays, This difference is to be aſcribed to the different Opinions of theſe who made the Plurality in the different Seſſions of that Aſſembly, or to a deſign of ſatisfying all Parties in theſe things that ſeemed Diſputable, and without Danger to either ſide. 3*dly*. He ſays, that if the Word *Covenant* in the *Catechiſms* be taken for a proper *Covenant*, that then they will contradict the *Confeſſion of Faith*, *Chap*: 6. § 3.

BUT, 1*ſt*. It's plain from his Words, That he entirely founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin to his poſterity, upon the Natural, not upon the Fede-

ral Relation, now its plain, *1ſt.* That in this he runs croſs to all Orthodox Divines, for they found it upon a Federal, not Natural Relation; as alſo to the *Catechiſms* which found the imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to his Poſterity, upon the Covenant's being made with him, not only for himſelf, but for his Poſterity, can there be any thing plainer, than that the Imputation of his Sin is founded upon his Federal Relation, for the Covenant might have been made with him alone, and not with his Poſterity. *2dly.* I never read, or heard of any Orthodox Divines, who Maintain a formal and proper Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to his Poſterity, but who found it upon a Federal Relation, if it be not ſome of *Placeus* way, who found it upon the previous Corruption of our Nature, whereby we virtually conſent to *Adam*'s ſin. *3dly.* This deſtroys any proper Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin to his Poſterity altogether, for ſo the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin is only a thing Natural, and an Ineviteable conſequence of his ſinning, upon Suppoſition, that he was to have Iſſue; and ſo only a Natural Conſequent of their Deſcending from *Adam*, whereby there is nothing peculiar in this Imputation, different from the Imputation of every Natural Parent, his ſin to his reſpective Poſterity; for there is the ſame Natural Relation here, that is betwixt *Adam* and his Poſterity, whereas the Larger *Catechiſms* founds this Imputation upon the Covenant's being made with *Adam*, as a publick Perſon, not only for himſelf, but for his Poſterity. *4thly.* The Word *Root*, muſt neceſſarly be underſtood of a Federal Root, becauſe its fit to explain the general Word (*Root*) by the more particular

Words

Words (*Publick Head*) uſed in the Larger *Catechiſm*, and becauſe theſe Words (*The Covenant being made with him, not only for himſelf but for his Poſterity*) cannot be underſtood of a meer Natural Relation, without doing Violence to the Words, of which Profeſſor *Simſon* is ſo convinced, that he Confeſſeth the *Catechiſms* ſeems to fix this Imputation, not upon the Natural, but Federal Relation, whereby any may perceive, that he is ſecretly convinced, that this Doctrine of his is contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith*. 5*thly*. Any may judge, what Dirt he caſts upon the Aſſembly met at *Weſtminſter*, while he ſays, That they ſtudied Words to Pleaſe all Parties, like the Council of *Trent*, leaving their Acts to be Expounded, according to the Opinion of each Party; and while he makes them a Factious Meeting, for he ſays, that their Acts were worded according to the Plurality of the Members of ſuch an Opinion, as made up that Seſſion, whereas I ſuppoſe, there was very little Difference in that Aſſembly about Doctrinals, whatever difference there was about the Government. 6*thly*. Is not the Covenant of Grace ſaid, in the larger *Catechiſm*, to be made with Chriſt, as the ſecond *Adam*, if the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin be founded upon the Natural, not upon the Federal Relation, Chriſt is very improperly called the ſecond *Adam*; for ſo the Ground of Imputation is not the ſame in both; And beſides, is not Chriſt called the Root of the Elect, *Joh*: 15. *Rom*: 11.? Will any ſay, That the Imputation of his Righteouſneſs is founded upon a Natural Relation? In a Word, I cannot perſwade my ſelf, that any who found the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin upon

the

the Natural Relation and not Federal, are found in the Point of the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin.

NEXT he gives us an Account of his Opinion upon the first Propoſition, *Pag.* 160, 161. And, 1*ſt.* he ſays, *He teaches the expreſs Words and Doctrine of the* Confeſſion of Faith, *concerning the Covenant of Works,* Chap: 4. § 2. Chap: 7. § 2. *As alſo the Doctrine of our* Catechiſms *about that Covenant.* But whether he does ſo or not, may be judged from what he hath already ſaid, and may be further judged, from what we ſhall hear from him preſently.

2. HE holds, *That this Diſpenſation, which* Chap: 4. *of our* Confeſſion § 2. *is called a Law and a Command, when* Chap: 7. § 2. *and alſo in the* Catechiſms *its called a Covenant, then the Word* Covenant *is not to be underſtood of a proper* Covenant, *in the ſtrict Senſe of Lawyers; for ſuch Contracts betwixt Man and Man, as are entered into by Stipulation, Re-ſtipulation and Ad-ſtipulation.*

AND therefore, 3*dly.* he ſays, *That he takes care to Explain the Terms* (Law *and* Covenant) *when taken in the ſtrict Senſe of Lawyers, as they are* modi obligandi ſpecie diſtincti; And ſo according to him, a Law is an Obligation laid on by the Authority of a lawful Superior. And he ſays, *He takes a Covenant in the more general Notion of a Paction or Covenant,* and ſo deſcribes it, *to be an Obligation contracted by Promiſe and Acceptance betwixt two Parties, whereof a Covenant entered into by Stipulation, Reſtipulation, &c. is a Species, which he thus Deſcribes, a mutual Paction entered into by mutual Stipulation and mutual Acceptance of the Parties, or by the asking and giving mutual Promiſes, which lays a mutual Obligation.*

4. HE ſays, *That the Word* Covenant *is frequently uſed in Scripture, and other Authors in a large Senſe, for any ſort of Obligation, or any way of Contracting an Obligation, ſo that ſometimes it ſignifies the thing that a Law, it's Oppoſite ſpecies does, as on the other Hand the Word Law, is taken oft times in the ſame Large Senſe.*

AND therefore, 5*thly*. From thence concludes, That the Authors of our *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſm*, do only uſe the Word *Covenant* in the Senſe wherein it is oft uſed, in Scriptures, *viz.* for what is properly a Law, in the ſtrict Senſe of Lawyers; And he ſays, the Reaſon why they ſo uſe it, is, Becauſe the Law of GOD hath this ſingular in it, that the Sanction thereof contains a Promiſe of a glorious reward to Obedience, which does not neceſſarly flow from the Nature of a Law in general; And therefore, Man could have no right to it, except by the Voluntary Condeſcention of GOD, as is expreſſed *Chap:* 7. of the *Confeſſion*, § 1. And ſo far he ſays it hath ſomething of the Nature of a Paction. 6*thly*. He ſays, that when he affirms, That the Word *Covenant* is not to be underſtood of a ſtrict and proper *Covenant*, that he does not in the leaſt Contradict the *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms*, becauſe this Diſpenſation is no where called a proper Covenant in them, nor is there any thing in them aſcribed to it, that is peculiar to a proper Covenant.

BUT 1*ſt*. It becauſe the Covenant of Works is called a Law and Command, it be not a proper Covenant, then neither is the Covenant of Grace a proper Covenant, for it is alſo called a Law, *Rom:* 3. And a Command, he ſaid is to Command his Covenant to a Thouſand Generations.

I take this to be a very weak Reaſon. 2*dly*. He does not diſtinctly tell us, whether the Covenant of Works be only a Law in the ſtrict Senſe of Lawyers, or a Paction or Covenant, in a more general Notion of a Paction; For according to his way of Reaſoning, it cannot be a Paction in the more general Notion of it, for we read nothing expreſly of a Promiſe, but only of a threatning, far leſs of *Adam*'s Conſent, and if he prove this by Conſequence, then by the ſame way, it will be eaſy to prove it was a proper Covenant. 3*dly*: I think it plain, that every Paction in its Nature, either expreſly or implicitly, includes all theſe ingredients he puts into a proper Covenant, as is plain to any that conſiders it. 4*thly*. That the Word *Covenant* is in Scripture, ſometimes taken more largely is true, when applyed to other Creatures as at the Flood, but when underſtood of a Covenant betwixt GOD and Man, I much doubt of it. I wiſh he had inſtanced ſome place of Scripture to this Purpoſe. 5*thly*. If the Word *Covenant* be only uſed in the *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms*, for what is properly a Law in the ſtrict Senſe of Lawyers, as he ſays it is; then the Covenant of Works, is not ſo much as a Covenant in the more general Notion of a Covenant, which elſe where, he ſeems to acknowledge, *Pag*: 163. of his Anſwers, yea, the Covenant of Grace will be only properly a Law in the ſtrict Senſe of Lawyers; for he ſays, the Word is only ſo uſed in the *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſms*, which is a little ſtrange indeed. 6*thly*. All Laws whatſoever that have a Sanction, imply a Promiſe of freedom from the Puniſhment to the Obſervers, which is a kind of

Re-

Reward; And therefore is not ſimply peculiar to the Law of GOD. *7thly.* All conditional Promiſes in their Nature, imply ſome Requiſition of a Conſent from the Party to whom the Promiſe is made, and conſequently a Propoſal of a Covenant, as is plain; And that place in the 7 *Chap:* of the *Confeſſion* he refers to, makes plainly againſt him; For it diſtinguiſheth betwixt the Obedience Man owes to GOD as a Creator, and ſo by Vertue of a ſtrict Law, and that which he owes from GOD's voluntary Condeſcention in making a Covenant, to which laſt the Covenant of Works is reduced, § 2 of that *Chap:* I think nothing can be plainer. *8thly.* If he therefore contradict not the *Confeſſion of Faith,* becauſe the Covenant of Works is therein no where called a proper Covenant, may not one ſay the ſame of the Covenant of Grace, yea, may not one deny Chriſt's Satisfaction to Juſtice, to be a proper Satisfaction, becauſe no where called ſo in Scripture: This way *Socinians* argue. Sure the *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſms* deſcribed it, ſo, as any would think it a proper Covenant, while its ſaid, GOD entered into a Covenant with *Adam,* a *Phraſe* frequently uſed of making Covenants, and that plainly implys a mutual Paction: And while it is ſaid that GOD promiſed him Life upon Condition of Obedience, which plainly implies a Requiſition of *Adam*'s conſent, ſure among Men, when one promiſeth a thing to another upon ſuch a Condition to be performed by him, any Body would think this to be the Propoſal of a proper Covenant or Bargain, I never thought that proper Laws, had Conditions annexed to them, *&c.*

Fur-

FURTHER *Pag:* 164. and 165. he ſays, *That Mr.* Webſter's *account of the Covenant of Works, hath nothing peculiar to a proper Covenant, for according to him, when GOD gave* Adam *a Law, threatned Death, promiſed Life,* &c. *there is nothing here but a Law or an Obligation laid upon him by Sovereign Authority.* And he ſays, *this laid a ſtronger Obligation upon* Adam, *than if he had taken his Promiſe for it:* And this he ſays, *is the ſpecifick Difference of a Law, as its a diſtinct Species from a Covenant.*

HE alſo grants *Pag:* 164, *That* Adam *had the Stock of his Poſterity in his hand, which upon his firſt Tranſgreſſion he was to loſe, not only for himſelf, but for his Poſterity in caſe he were allowed to have any after his Fall.*

MOREOVER, He grants, *That* Adam *acquieſced in this Law as Holy and Juſt;* but yet he affirms, *That this can no more make the Covenant of Works a proper Covenant, than the Satisfaction of Subjects, with good Laws impoſed upom them by an Abſolute Monarch, does turn them into a Covenant betwixt him and them:* He further ſays, *That GOD's obliging Himſelf to* Adam *by Promiſe, is a thing very agreeable to a Law, as alſo Confirming it by External Symbol, ſuch as the Tree of Life, is very agreeable to the ſolemn Ratification of a Law, as well as of a Covenant; So that according to Mr.* Simſon, *there is not here the leaſt thing, that belongs to a proper Covenant.* And further adds, *That the Obligation laid upon* Adam *by a Command is much ſtronger, than if GOD had taken his Promiſe for it, which according to him, is the ſpecifick difference of a Covenant from a Law.*

AND yet further aſſerts, *That the ſame Account is given of the Covenant of Works, in the* Confeſſion of

Faith

Faith, *and* Catechiſms, *where there is nothing peculiar to a proper Covenant in it:* And ſays, Pag 165. *The ſame holds true of the Texts of Scripture, made uſe of in them, to prove the Doctrine: In all which it is called a* Law, *and not a* Covenant *in any one of them; as alſo, that from* Rom: 5:12, *to Verſe* 20: *there is Mention made of a Law, not of a Covenant*: So that according to him, Paul *founds the Imputation of Sin upon a Law, not upon a Covenant: For it's called, one Man's Sin and Diſobedience; but not one Word of a Breach of Promiſe, or of a Covenant*; And therefore concludes, *That his denying the Covenant of Works, to be a proper Covenant in the ſtrict Senſe of Lawyers, is not contrary to the Confeſſion of Faith, ſeing he calls it as they do, and underſtands the ſame thing by it*, &c.

Here is dangerous Doctrine, a little ſmoothed: For 1ſt. I conceive, That a proper Covenant is a *Genus* agreeable to the various *Species* of ſuch a Covenant; ſo as theſe various *Species* do all partake of the general Nature of a proper Covenant; and ſo a proper Covenant, takes in a plurality of Rational and Free Agents, where there is a Propoſal by one Party, of ſomething to be conſented to, or done by the other, with a Promiſe of ſomething to be enjoyed, upon their ſo conſenting, or doing, with a Requiſition, either virtual or explicite, of a Conſent or Acceptance, by the other Party; this ſure makes a Propoſal of a proper Covenant, and the other Party's Conſent makes it a formal and compleat Covenant; abſtracting from the Obligation, that may otherwiſe ly upon that Party to accept, whether he conſent or not, as alſo abſtracting from the ſecret Power, whereby, may be, he is brought to conſent

ſent: Now all theſe are in the Covenant of Works: For 1*ſt*. Here is a Plurality of Parties. 2*dly*. A Propoſal of Life on GOD's Part, to be had by *Adam* upon Condition of perfect Obedience, to be performed by him; as the *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms* expreſs it. 3*dly*. That *Adam* did conſent to this Propoſal, is plain; becauſe he was perfect, and Mr. *Simſon* himſelf owns, That *Adam* did conſent. 4*thly*. All the Difficulty is about requiring *Adam* his Conſent, which Mr. *Simſon* denies to have been done: And therefore ſays, *It was not a proper Covenant*. But 1*ſt*. It follows not, that his Conſent was not required; becauſe we read it not expreſly: For he himſelf does confeſs, *That* Adam *did conſent*: Yet we read as little of *Adam*'s Conſent, *viz*. expreſly, as we read of it's being taken; and we read not of a Promiſe expreſly; yet he grants, there was a Promiſe. 2*dly*. It can be proven by good Conſequence, and from other Scriptures, as all Divines prove a great many things concerning this Covenant: For 1*ſt*. *Adam* did conſent, as he himſelf owns; Therefore it was required: For if it was *Adam*'s Duty to conſent, certainly it behoved to be in Obedience to a Command requiring it. 2*dly*. We read not, that *Adam* was required to believe, when the firſt Goſpel Promiſe was revealed to him, and yet no Orthodox Divine ever queſtioned it, or that it was the Revelation of the Covenant of Grace, though it be not there called a Covenant. 3*dly*. The Context, *Gen:* 3. holds forth a Paction, and Tranſaction betwixt GOD and *Adam* very plainly: For here is a plain Propoſal of Life to *Adam* upon his Obedience, and a threatning

ning of Death upon his Diſobedience; and GOD's ſo particularly telling, what Trees he might eat of, and what not; and his appending a Seal to the ſeveral Sanctions of the Law, argues plainly a Tranſaction, and conſequently a taking his Conſent: Sure there is more here to prove it a proper Covenant, than there is, *Gen:* 3. to prove the Promiſe of the *bruiſing the Serpent's Head*, &c. to have been the Covenant of Grace: This may ſeem further clear from *Exod*: 24. Where upon the Peoples Conſent (we read not expreſly of its being required) both the People and Book of the Covenant are ſprinkled. *4thly*. *Adam*'s Conſent was required, becauſe the Moral Law obliged him to conſent, to every Propoſal made by his Maker, otherwiſe than it's among Men, where the Propoſal of a Covenant by one, does not ay oblige the other to accept. *5thly*. All Offers and Propoſals of Advantage made to another, upon certain Conditions in their very Nature, imply a Deſire, and requiring the Conſent and Acceptance of the Perſon, to whom ſuch an Offer is made; but here was ſuch an Offer: Will any ſay, That when a Parent promiſeth ſuch a thing to his Child, upon ſuch a Condition, though the Parent requires not expreſly the Child's Conſent, that there is not a virtual Requiſition thereof? For to what End is ſuch a Profer made, if this be not implyed in it? *6thly*. GOD is ſaid, in the *Catechiſms* and *Confeſſion*, to enter into a Covenant, and to have made a Covenant, which plainly implies a mutual Tranſaction; and ſo a taking of *Adam*'s Conſent, ſee *Ezek: 16: I entred into a Covenant with thee*, &c. Sure it's an odd way of

ſpeaking

ſpeaking, to ſay, *An abſolute Sovereign entred into a Law*, or, *made a Law with his People*; for the Phraſe plainly imports a formal and mutual Tranſaction: We read not expreſly of *Adam*'s Conſent, either taken or given: Becauſe 1*ſt*. He was perfect, and ſo there was no Ground to doubt of his conſenting. 2*dly*. Becauſe GOD being Man's abſolute Sovereign, the Propoſal of ſuch a Bargain, did oblige *Adam* to conſent.

2. IT's falſe, That when GOD required of *Adam* perfect Obedience, and upon that Condition promiſed him Life, and otherwiſe threatned Death; there is Nothing but an Obligation laid upon him by Sovereign Authority: For all conditional Promiſes in their Nature imply the Offer of a Covenant, and a requiring the Acceptance of the Perſon to whom the Offer is made either more explicitely, or implicitely, as we hinted before; only ſuch Propoſals made by the Great GOD oblige to accept, not only from the Benefite offered, but alſo from the abſolute and infallibly Authority of GOD: But this no Way hinders it from being a proper Covenant, more than when a Parent promiſes ſuch a Reward to a Child, if he does his Duty: For here is a Propoſal of a Paction, with a tacite Requiſition of the Child's Acceptance.

3. THERE are good Reaſons, why the Covenant of Works is ſo often called a *Law*; as 1*ſt*. The very Propoſal of it did oblige *Adam* to conſent, otherwiſe than it is common among Men. 2*dly*. Becauſe, it conſiſted chiefly of Commands, and had but one Promiſe of Life; but no Promiſe of Strength to perform; Becauſe he was perfect.

3*dly*.

3dly. Becauſe GOD therein dealt with Man by Way of diſtributive Juſtice. *4thly.* To point out the different Way of Juſtification by it, from that by the Covenant of Grace, *Rom:* 4. and *Rom:* 10.

4. HE denies the Covenant of Works to have been a proper Covenant; becauſe there was no Conſent required of *Adam*, or Promiſe taken, nor do we read of any thing mentioned of *Adam's* Conſent: Now if this was not a proper Covenant it muſt be either, *1ſt.* Becauſe there could not be a proper Covenant betwixt GOD and Man: But I would think, he will not affirm this; for if GOD had taken *Adam's* promiſe and Conſent according to himſelf, it would have been a proper Covenant: And will he deny, but GOD might have taken *Adam's* Promiſe? Or, *2dly.* Becauſe we read not of *Adam's* Conſent required and given; but this we proved juſt now, That it was required: He himſelf grants, *Adam* did conſent; and yet confeſſeth there is no Mention of it: And is it not as juſt, to ſay, His Conſent was required, ſince he acknowledgeth he gave it? For he could not give it, if it was not required. And did not the Law oblige him, to conſent to every Propoſal made by his Creator? Again did not the ſingling out of one Duty, *viz: Forbearing to eat*, &c. confirming it with a double Symbol, point plainly out a Paction? and conſequently a taking and giving of *Adam's* Conſent: And do we read of a Promiſe expreſly, more than of *Adam's* Conſent taken, and given? Yet he owns there was a Promiſe. Or, *3dly.* Becauſe it frequently is called a *Law*, and never a Covenant: But is not the Covenant of Grace frequently called

led a *Law* alſo? And though it be called a Law; yet is it not called ſuch a Law, whereby the Reward is had by way of Debt, *Rom*: 4. which ſhews, it's like a Covenant betwixt a Maſter and a Servant; yea, it's expreſly called a *Covenant*, *Hoſ*: 6. and *Gal*. :4. And Mr. *Gilleſpie* proves ſtrongly, that *Gal*: 4. is underſtood of the Covenant of Works and Grace; ſee his *Ark of the Teſtament*, *Part*: 1. *chap*: 5. *Pag*: 180. Or, 4*thly*. Becauſe *Adam* was not at Liberty to conſent, or diſſent: But this would deſtroy all proper Covenants betwixt GOD and Man; yea, betwixt a Parent and a Child, where the thing required by the Parent, is antecedently a Duty: Becauſe the Child is not at Liberty to refuſe: And *Adam* though he was not free *Morally* to conſent, or diſſent, yet he was free *phyſically*.

FURTHER, that it was a proper Covenant, is clear, *firſt*, All Divines own, that GOD's Way of dealing with Man from firſt to laſt hath been Covenant-ways, as is plain from Scripture, and they give very good Reaſons for it. 2*dly*. From *Rom*: 10. *Verſe* 5. *Galat*: 3. 12. *The Man that does theſe Things, ſhall live in them*: Where, *firſt*, It's plain, from all Orthodox Interpreters, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Covenant of Works. 2*dly*. That here is a Way of getting Life, (though now not poſſible) upon Condition of Obedience, which is a Propoſal of a Covenant, if any Thing be ſuch; for a Propoſal of an Advantage to be had by another, upon Condition to be performed by him, is a Propoſal of a Covenant, and implys in it's Nature a requiring of Acceptance. As when one offers to another a Parcel of Goods upon

upon a certain Price, it's an offer of a Bargain. 3*dly*. It's plain from the Oppoſition betwixt the Law of Works, and the Law of Faith, as two Oppoſite Ways, whereby to obtain Life, *Rom*: 3. 27, 28. *&c*. Where it's plain, the Covenant of Works is a proper Covenant; for in both, Juſtification is propoſed to be had upon certain Conditions, in the one Works are the Condition, in the other Faith in a Mediator; So that if the one be ſimply a Law, the other muſt be ſo alſo; for they are both called a Law, and if the one be a proper Covenant, the other muſt be ſuch alſo. 4*thly*. All Men are by Nature under the Curſe of the Covenant of Works, *Gal*. 3. 10. Now their lyableneſs to the Curſe, muſt be founded either 1*ſt*. Simply upon our Natural Relation to *Adam* as our Parent, But this plainly deſtroys the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin altogether, as is plain. Or 2*dly*. Upon the Extent of the Threatning to the Poſterity of *Adam*; but this alſo deſtroys the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin; for even tho GOD threatens to puniſh the ſins of Parents, on their Poſterity, but this is no proper Imputation, the ſins of Parents are not properly Imputed to them, only they ſuffer, as Parts of their Parents, the ſins of no Parent is now imputed to their Poſterity, unleſs by ſome act of their's they do make it their own ſin; but *Adam*'s ſin is imputed before we can commit actual ſin, for it's oppoſed to the Corruption of our Nature. Or 3*dly*. It muſt be founded upon his Repreſenting them, which can never be underſtood without a Covenant Tranſaction; for *Adam* might

have been the Natural Head of his Poſterity, and yet not Repreſented them, as is plain.

5. IT's plain from the *Confeſſion of Faith*, and *Catechiſms*, where GOD is ſaid to enter into a Covenant with Man to make a Covenant, and to Promiſe Life, and to require Perfect Obedience, as the Condition, and to make this Covenant not only for himſelf, but for his Poſterity: Can any Thing be ſaid more fully to hold forth a proper Covenant, or is more ſaid of the Covenant of Grace in the Confeſſion and Catechiſms, *&c.*

6. I want to know the abſurdity of calling it a proper Covenant; for it's plain, the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, and the Corruption of our Nature, can never be accounted for without this: And it's plain, that the Difficulties againſt it's being a proper Covenant, turn upon the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, and ſince he ſeems to own the Imputation of that ſin; it is very ſtrange, what ſhould move him to deny it's being a proper Covenant, unleſs he have a new and different Notion of the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin. It ſeems if we did read of *Adam*'s Conſent, required and taken, he would allow it to be a proper Covenant; but was not the Moral Law a ſufficient Obligation on him to conſent, yea did not the conditional Propoſal of Life in it's Nature, imply a Requiſition of his Conſent, and did not the adding of Seals fairly imply *Adam*'s Conſent; do we read of a Conſent required of *Adam*, when the Covenant of Grace was firſt Preached to him. If we read not of GOD's requiring *Adam*'s Conſent, it was becauſe he was Perfect: Whereas now being ſinful, our Acceptance of the Covenant

ant of Grace, is urged by ſo many Argu-ents, *&c.*

He ſays, That the Law, which he calls the *Covenant of Works*, was given to *Adam* and his oſterity; no otherwiſe than all common Laws re preſcribed by a Sovereign to his People: Now here we ſee him opening very plainly; for o *Adam* repreſented his Poſterity, no other Way, than Subjects repreſent their Poſterity, when aws are preſcribed to them by their Sovereign; nd ſo *Adam*'s Sin is no otherwiſe imputed to is Poſterity, than the Rebellion of Subjects is o their Poſterity; which any may ſee deſtroys mputation, and is what *Arminians* own.

He ſays further, That the Obligation laid u-on *Adam*, enforced by a Sanction, is much ronger than if GOD had taken *Adam*'s Pro-iſe for it: But this ſeems ſtrange: For *1ſt.* I ould think that no Obligation is ſo ſtrong, as hat is come under by a Man's own free Con-nt; ſee *Jer:* 34. *2dly.* An Obligation by Law, and *Adam*'s Conſent together, is as rong as an Obligation by a ſingle Law, and *dam*'s Conſent did bind it more ſtrongly u-on himſelf, and when he brake, did greaten is Guilt, and did clear GOD's Juſtice more.

Again, he ſays, *Pag:* 164, 165. *That* Adam's *oſterity upon his Fall were to be born ſinful, as a art of the Puniſhment of his Sin*, &c. Now this I o not underſtand, for he ſeems to make his Po-terity ſimply, as his Poſterity, and not as repre-ented in him, to fall under this Corruption of Nature. *2dly.* He ſeems to make the firſt Sin, nly *Adam*'s Sin and not the Sin of his Poſterity

alſo; and ſo to make this Corruption a ſimple Puniſhment with Reference to them; ſo that they ſuffer no otherwiſe for *Adam*'s Sin: Then as they are natural Deſcendants from him, which is plainly to deſtroy the Imputation of his Sin. 2*dly*. He ſeems to doubt whether *Adam* would have had Poſterity or not upon his Fall, if a Remedy had not been provided? Now this is ſtrange, for ſo in that Caſe, *Adam* could not have repreſented his Poſterity; becauſe he would not have been ſuffered to have had any: And it's plain, he calls *Adam* a publick Head, only as a natural Root and Parent. This would incline one to think, That according to him, GOD could not have juſtly imputed *Adam*'s Sin to his Poſterity unleſs he had at the ſame Time provided a Remedy; and ſo alſo as none ſhould ſuffer for *Adam*'s Sin but who in their own Perſons did reject that Remedy revealed, either more clearly or more darkly; ſo that there ſeems to be more under this, than he hath thought fit to expreſs.

HE ſays moreover, That *Adam*'s Conſent does no more prove it a proper Covenant, than the Conſent of Subjects to the Laws of an abſolute Monarch, *&c.* But 1*ſt*. At this Rate the *Covenant of Grace*, is not a proper Covenant: For it's the Law and Declaration of an abſolute Sovereign, proclaiming Indemnity upon believing, and binds whether Men conſent or not. If it be replyed, That GOD requires our Conſent now, which GOD did not under the *Covenant of Works*, as abſolute Monarchs ſeek not the Conſent of Subjects to their Laws? We anſwer 1*ſt*. We

read not that GOD required *Adam*'s Conſent to the firſt Goſpel Promiſe; yet all acknowledge, That it was the *Covenant of Grace*. *2dly.* There is more to be ſaid for his Conſent being required, than that it was not required: He grants that *Adam* did conſent, though we read it not: Now the one is as eaſily proven as the other. *3dly.* When GOD made a Covenant with *Abraham*, *Gen:* 17. we read not of *Abraham*'s Conſent required, only of ſome external Rites confirming the Covenant; which we have alſo in the *Covenant of Works*. *4thly.* When a Monarch preſcribes a Law, with a conditional Promiſe of a Reward to the Obſervers, requiring their Conſent, as certainly GOD did *Adam*'s, any would think this the Propoſal of a Covenant; turn the Caſe into the Words of the *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms*, viz. ſuch a Prince entred into a Covenant with his People, where he promiſed great Honours to the Obſervers of the Law, and threatned Death to the Tranſgreſſors, confirming the ſame with external Seals: If this would not be a Propoſal of a Covenant, I know not what would be ſuch: Beſides, entring into a Covenant, plainly implies the mutual Conſent of Parties.

HE ſays, further, *Pag:* 165. *That Seals are Rites agreeable to the ſolemn Ratification of Laws, as well as of Covenants.* But *1ſt.* This is not ſo ordinary. *2dly.* There is a Difference betwixt Rites and Seals; every Rite is not a proper Seal: There are Rites uſed that give the Laws Life, as touching with the Scepter. But it's not ſo ordinary to ſubjoin external Seals to them,

after

after they have received their binding Force from the legiſlative Power. 3*dly*. Any Rites in that Caſe refer chiefly to the binding Force of the Law, not to the confirming any Promiſe annexed, as here it's plain that the two Symbols reſpected the Promiſe and Threatning. 4*thly*. Let any read the Deſcription of the *Covenant of Works*, in the *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms*, and he may judge whether the Deſcription will bear, that they were only Rites, confirming a ſtrict Law; nor is the Argument drawn only from this, but from the concomitant Circumſtances.

As to *Rom*: 5. We anſwer, That Christ's Righteouſneſs, is there called the Obedience of One: Now will it not follow, from his Way of reaſoning, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs was the Fulfilment of a meer Law, and not of a Covenant or Engagement? So that the Covenant of Redemption, was only a Law, not a Covenant. 2*dly*. It's ſtrange if the Word *Law*, in the Scriptures, cited in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, ſignify only a ſtrict Law, not a proper Covenant; and that the Compilers of the *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſms*, have fallen into ſuch a Blunder, that they ſo frequently call it a Covenant and never a Law; yea, deſcribe it ſo, as any indifferent Perſon may judge it to be a true and proper Covenant.

He ſeems to own himſelf one of them who are for the abſoluteneſs of the Covenant of Grace; For he ſays *Pag*: 168. He is one of them who maintain it: But 157. He ſeems to be made up of Singularities, for I never heard of any who maintained the Covenant of Works to be only a Law, that alſo Defended the abſoluteneſs of the Covenant of Grace,

nor

nor of any that were for the laſt, that defended the firſt; ſo that he Defends both the Extreams on this Subject. 2*dly*. He expreſly in that ſame 168 *Pag*: owns the Covenant of Grace to be a proper Covenant, becauſe *Chap*: 7: § 3: of the *Confeſſion*, GOD is ſaid to offer Life and Salvation by Jeſus Chriſt, and require Faith in Him, that they may be ſaved, *&c*. Now if it be a proper Covenant, wherein GOD requires Faith as a Condition of Salvation, I ſee not how the Covenant of Grace can be abſolute; ſo that he ſeems to contradict himſelf in one, and the ſame Page. 3*dly*. Will any Body of Common Senſe ſay, when in the *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms*, GOD is ſaid to have entered into a Covenant with Man, Promiſing him Life upon Condition of Perfect Obedience, that there was not a requiring Perfect Obedience, as the Condition of obtaining the Promiſe, though it be not ſaid ſo in as many Words; For ſure all Conditional Promiſes on GOD's Part, carry a Command upon us to fulfil the Condition, upon which the Promiſe is ſuſpended, *&c*.

LASTLY, He cites ſome Divines, as of his Judgment; The firſt is *Franciſcus Junius* in his *Theſ*: *Theolog*. *De fœdere et Teſtamentis Divinis*, where ſpeaking of the Covenant of Works, *Theſ*: 4. He ſays, *Fœdus ſive pactum dicimus, non propria illa ſignificatione, qua pro mutuo contractu, et duarum partium Diſpoſitione ſumitur*. But firſt, it's obſerveable, that all the Divines he cites call it a Covenant and Paction, never a Law: It's ſtrange that they never, or but ſeldom give it it's proper Name. 2*dly*. That he means ſuch Covenants wherein, every Party hath an Hand in making his own

own Terms, as is plain from the Words (*duarum partium diſpoſitione*) Now Man hath no ordering or diſpoſing in any Covenant GOD makes with him, and indeed neither the Covenant of Works, nor of Grace is ſuch a Covenant; but he will not ſay, that this is neceſſary to the Nature of a proper Covenant, as it's a *Genus* to all ſuch Covenants, otherwiſe there can be no proper Covenant betwixt GOD, and any of his Creatures, and that this is the meaning, is plain to any, who will read that Place.

THE ſecond Teſtimony he cites, is of *Hoornbeck, de fœdere DEI*, Theſ: 2. *Quippe inter DEUM et Hominem non proprie contractus, qualis inter nos mutuo inivi intelligendus*: But it's plain he ſpeaks of ſuch Contracts, wherein every Party hath an Hand in making his own Terms, and indeed the Covenant of Works is not ſuch a Covenant. 2*dly*. A tacite and virtual Covenant, is properly a Covenant, as well as when entred into with more Formality, there is a gradual Difference, as to the Explicitneſs, but it hath ſtill all the Eſſentials of a proper Covenant.

A third Teſtimony he cites *Page* 172. is, Mr. *Rutherfords Examen: Arminianiſmi, page* 314, where he ſays, *That we ſinned in* Adam, *and are Born in ſin, not by Nature, but by paction and a ſpecial Law of GOD*; (*hoc autem non eſt factum Naturæ ergo pacto et ſpeciali DEI lege*) and ſays, *That he owns, that ſpeaking according to Law Terms, GOD gave him ſuch a Law, by which his ſin was imputed to all his Poſterity*. 2*dly*. Mr. *Rutherford's* Reaſon in his ſecond Argument, why he calls it a *pactum* or *fœdus*, is, *ubi eſt promiſſio et Comminatio*

tio inflicta ibi eſt Fœdus et pactum: From whence Mr. *Simſon* alledgeth, that Mr. *Rutherford* cannot be ſuppoſed to have taken the Covenant of Works for a proper Covenant, unleſs we ſuppoſe he underſtood not the Difference betwixt a proper Covenant, and a proper Law. 3*dly*. He pretends to confirm this, from his Book *de Provid: cap:* 18. *pag:* 211, 212. where one of his Arguments to prove, *Quod DEUS voluit peccatum fieri ſe permittente*, is, *quia DEUS ex fœdere primo, quod ſolo Liberrimo et ſapiente ſuo arbitrio fecit cum* Adamo, *hanc legem tulit, ut ſi* Adamus *peccaret, in eo omnes ejus Poſteri peccarent, etiam, DEUS potuit, ſiquidem ita ei viſum fuiſſet, Legem tuliſſe, qua ſi* Adamus *peccaret, ipſe ſolus reus foret, et Poſteri ejus omnes innocentes naſcerentur, et cum nos nondum nati eramus, patet nullo actu Perſonali, nos eum fluxum pœnalem impedire poſſe: quippe Creaturam declinare pœnam a Creatore inflictam non eſt poſſibile.*

AND from this infers, 1*ſt*. That Mr. *Rutherford* founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to his Poſterity; As alſo the Propagation of Original ſin to them, upon the arbitrary Conſtitution and Law of GOD, by which Mr. *Simſon* thinks is evidently meaned the Sanction of the Law. 2*dly*. He infers, That *Adam*'s Poſterity could have no manner of Acceſſion, either to *Adam*'s Fact of eating the Forbidden Fruit, or to the Propagation of Original ſin, becauſe the whole flowed from an arbitrary Conſtitution of GOD, which they could not hinder. 3*dly*. He infers, That the Communion of HumaneNature alone is not a ſufficient Ground, for the communion of a Law, and

and of ſin, betwixt a Father and Son; and ſays he is of the ſame Mind, and that he founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, upon the Natural Relation, and the particular Sanction of the Law of Works, according to *Chap. 6. § 3.* of the *Confeſſion.*

BUT this Teſtimony does not anſwer his Purpoſe; For *1ſt.* His calling it not only a Paction, but a ſpecial Law, proves not that Mr. *Rutherford*, took the Covenant of Works for an improper Covenant; for does he not call it *ſpeciale pactum*: As alſo in the very *Paragraph* preceeding this queſtion, which much more proves it was a proper Covenant, that he takes *Pactum* and *Lex* for the ſame Thing; and it's being called a ſpecial Law, no way proves it was not a proper Covenant, becauſe, all Propoſals of a Covenant on GOD's Part, have the force of a Law to oblige us to accept, otherwiſe than it is among Men, and it's plain the Notion of a Paction, imports a mutual Agreement. *2dly.* Mr. *Rutherford* underſtood a proper Covenant well enough, when he proves it from the *promiſſio facta*, and *Comminatio inflicta*; For all conditional Promiſes, are in their Nature the Propoſal of a Covenant, or Bargain, and do naturally imply a Requiſition of a Conſent from him, to whom this conditional Promiſe is made. *3dly.* This ſpecial Law or Paction takes in not only the Sanction, but principally the command; and therefore he muſt found the Imputation of ſin upon the Command: Further I would know what Mr. *Simſon* underſtands by that ſpecial Law, or Paction? For it cannot be the Command ſimply, as is plain;

For

For Mr. *Rutherford* ſays, That the Command might have been given to *Adam*, and yet his Poſterity not have been concerned in his Guilt, as was juſt now cited; It cannot be the extending of the Threatning to his Poſterity; becauſe the Threatning cannot be called a Law or a Paction, but is only a Sanction confirming the Law, beſides that the Threatning ſpeaking properly, can only extend to them who are under the Command; ſo that the extending of the Threatning to *Adam*'s Poſterity ſuppoſes plainly that they were under the Command. 3*dly* Or by this ſpecial Law and Paction muſt be underſtood a Divine arbitrary Conſtitution appointing *Adam* to Repreſent his Poſterity in his Obſervance of the Covenant of Works. And as this is the Truth, ſo it plainly implys a proper Federal Tranſaction between GOD and *Adam*.

As to his firſt Inference he draws, that the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to his Poſterity, is founded upon this arbitrary Conſtitution and Law of GOD. We Anſwer, That the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin is founded upon his Repreſenting his Poſterity in his Obedience or Diſobedience, and that his thus Repreſenting them is founded upon that Conſtitution, whereby he was appointed to Repreſent them as their Publick and Federal Head. 2*dly*. The ſecond Inference, That *Adam*'s Poſterity could have no manner of Acceſs to *Adam*'s eating the Forbidden Fruit, is ſtrange; for how could then his ſin be imputed to them? For where there is no communion in ſinning, there can be no Imputation of ſin: It is alſo falſe; For his being con-

conſtitute their Head by that ſpecial Law, made them to ſin, when he ſinned, according to our *Catechiſms* which ſays, *That the Covenant being made with* Adam, *not only for himſelf; but for his Poſterity*, that we all ſinned and fell in him. It's true indeed they could not hinder the Conſtitution, whereby *Adam* was made to Repreſent them; but beſides that the Conſtitution was juſt, and ſo made them have ſome way a Hand in *Adam's* ſin, they could no more hinder the extending of the Sanction to themſelves, and therefore by the ſame Reaſon, they cannot be lyable to the Puniſhment. Might not one reaſon the ſame Way, That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs cannot be Imputed to Believers, becauſe we had no Acceſs to the Conſtitution, appointing him to Repreſent the Elect in his Obedience.

As to his third Inference, he draws, *That Mr.* Rutherford *thinks, that Communion in Nature alone, is not a ſufficient Ground for the Communion of a Law, and of Sin between a Father and a Son*: Wherein he ſays *That he is of the ſame Mind with Mr.* Rutherford: And ſays, *That he founds the Imputation of* Adam's *Sin upon the natural Relation, and the particular Sanction of the Law of Works.* We remark, *firſt*, That he ſeems in the 159 *Pag*: of his *Anſwers*, to found the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin intirely upon the natural Relation; where gloſſing the Words of the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap*: 6. *Parag*: 3. *They being the Root of all Mankind*, &c. He alledges from theſe Words, *That the Imputation of* Adam's *Sin is founded upon the Natural Relation, to which*, he ſays, *he perfectly agrees; and not on the federal*: Where he ſpeaks not a Word of the

the Sanction. 2*dly*. We remark, That while he founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin on the natural Relation, and the particular Sanction of the Law, he paſſes the only Foundation of the Imputation of that Sin, *viz*. *Adam*'s repreſenting us, as our publick Head; for *Adam*'s natural Relation to us can never found his repreſenting of us, as is plain: And as little can the extending of the Sanction to *Adam*'s Poſterity found this Repreſentation; being a Conſequent of, and ſuppoſing his Repreſentation: For the Threatning, to ſpeak properly, can be denounced againſt none, but who are under the Command; becauſe the Threatning being founded upon the Breach of the Command, ſuppoſes a Breach of the Command, in them who fall under it; but of this more afterwards.

THE next Author he names, is *Gilleſpie* in his *Ark of the Covenant*, *Pag*: 102. *chap*: 3. where he ſays, *In Covenants between Man and Man, the Conditions of Covenants do not bind, except they be conſented to, but GOD's Covenant tarries not for Man's Conſent, nor doth the Obligation thereof depend upon Man's Conſent:* His Reaſon for it is, *Becauſe his Covenant is a Law:*. But this Teſtimony is little to his Purpoſe: Becauſe 1*ſt*. Tho' every Propoſal of a Covenant upon GOD's Part, have the Force of a Law, to oblige us to conſent; yet that no way hinders it from being a formal and proper Covenant: Doth not a Parent's propoſing a Reward to the Child, upon the doing of his Duty, oblige the Child to conſent; and yet none will deny, but this is the Propoſal of a Covenant or Bargain. 2*dly*. The ſame Author *Pag*: 98. tells us, *That we are not to make GOD's Covenant with Man differ ſo far from Covenants*

nants betwixt Man and Man, as to make it no Covenant at all: And ſays, *That tho' the Covenant of Works, be called the Law of Works, we are not therefore, to confound GOD's Covenant with Man, with what is called by the Name of a Law; as if there were nothing elſe in that Covenant, but what is in a Law:* And he ſays the ſame of the Covenant of Grace, with Reference to it's being called a Promiſe and a Teſtament. 3*dly.* Mr. *Gilleſpie* in the following *Pag:* 99. names ſix Properties of a proper Covenant in general, that agree to every Covenant between GOD and Man; as *Plurality of Parties, mutual Agreement and conſent of Parties, mutual conditions of one Kind or another, ſome Reciprocation of Performance,* &c. From all which it appears, how unfairly Mr. *Gilleſpie* is adduced by Mr. *Simſon.*

TURRETTINE has as little to his Purpoſe, as is plain to any, who will read the Place cited by him, *Loc:* 8. Where it is plain, when he ſays, *Certum eſt Fœdus DEI cum Homine, ſtricte loquendo, intercedere non poſſe:* That he is ſpeaking of ſuch Covenants, as are made up between Man and Man, as is plain from the Lines immediatly preceeding theſe Words, where he lays down theſe Conditions of Covenants between Man and Man, as, *That the Parties be equal, either ſimply, or in ſome other reſpect; That the things ſtipulated be in their Power; That the Parties be at their own Diſpoſal; That they be not obliged to the Duties engaged in, by any Obligation preceeding the Covenant Paction:* And then immediatly ſubjoyns the Words cited by Mr. *Simſon:* From which it is evident how little this Teſtimony makes to his Purpoſe: It ſeems Mr. *Simſon* would caſt Duſt before the Eyes of his

his Reader, by catching at a Word here and there, in the Authors he cites.

As to the ſecond Branch, *viz.* Adam's *being a federal Head*, he ſays, *Pag.* 174. 175. *That if by a federal Head be meant, That* Adam *was ſuch a publick Perſon, and Repreſentative of his Poſterity, as the Law of Works*, as explained by him, *could make him, that then he owns*, Adam *was a federal Head to his Poſterity; but then*, thinks, *That this is a new, improper and unwarry Deſignation, not uſed in our Confeſſion, and other Confeſſions, or VVritings of our Reformers, which have not one Word of a proper Covenant, or of* Adam's *being a federal Head.* 2*dly.* He ſays, *He finds it very lyable to be miſtaken, and to give our Enemies an Handle, to miſrepreſent our Doctrine, and to impugn it with Arguments, not eaſie to be anſwered.* 3*dly. That therefore, he thinks it his Duty to warn the Students of this; and ſo he chooſes to make Uſe of more proper Terms, agreeable to our own Confeſſion, and the Writings of the Reformers.* 4*thly.* He thinks, *That theſe Reformers have explained the Doctrine of the Law and Covenant of Works*, &c. *in a way more agreeable to Scripture and Reaſon, and leſs lyable to Objections than our later Divines have done.*

2. He ſays, *If by* Federal Head *be meant, That* Adam *was conſtitute ſuch a Head, by Vertue of a proper Covenant, in the ſtrict Senſe of Lawyers, or that he repreſented his Poſterity, in ſuch a ſtrict and proper Covenant, that GOD made with him; then he denies him to have been a federal Head*: And further ſays, *If* Adam *be thus a federal Head, it muſt have another Foundation, than the Law of Creation, confirmed with a Promiſe and Threatning; for tho' that Law or Covenant does conſtitute* Adam *a publick Head or Re-*

pre-

preſentative, ſo as thereby his firſt Sin was imputed to his Poſterity, and they derived a corrupt Nature from him; yet, ſays, *This can never make him to repreſent them in a ſtrict and proper Covenant:* And ſays alſo, *That a Divine Conſtitution, differing from the Law of Works, whereby* Adam *was conſtitute a federal Head, is not what he has yet read in his Bible.*

Now let us a little conſider thir things, and, firſt, I want to know the Senſe in which he allows *Adam* to have been a Federal Head, according to his way of Explaining the Covenant of Works, for he does not tell us the Senſe in which he allows him to be the Publick Head of his Poſterity, whether he was a Natural or a Federal Head, for I know not a third. 2*dly.* That he condemns the Expreſſion of a Federal Head, as an unwary Expreſſion, I judge it a bold Cenſuring of ſo many Eminent Divines, who have ſo expreſſed themſelves as uſing unwary Expreſſions; Yea, of all the Miniſtry of this Church, who ſo expreſs themſelves upon this Head; when Men are diſpleaſed with a Doctrine they commonly carp at the Terms: Never a Profeſſor of Divinity in this Church but himſelf did condemn this Expreſſion, as unwary. 3*dly.* It's true the Expreſſion of a Federal Head, is not uſed in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, but ſure the Definition of a Federal Head is uſed, while *Adam* and *Eve*, *Chap.* 6. 3. are called the Root of all Mankind, upon which the imputation of *Adam*'s Sin is there intirely Founded, now all have hitherto granted, that their being a natural Root, can never found the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, and while the Covenant is ſaid to have been made with *Adam*, not only for himſelf but for his Poſterity,

&c.

&c. can any thing hold forth his being a Federal Head more plainly; In ſo much, that Mr. *Simſon* himſelf Confeſſeth, that here the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin ſeems to be founded upon a Federal Relation, does he think, that all Terms of Divinity muſt be found in our *Confeſſion*, I would know what kind of Head he will allow *Adam* to have been, and if he would find his Terms in the *Confeſſion*. And, 4*thly*. Is not the ſame thing meaned by a Federal Head found in the Writings of the Reformers, are there not ſeveral Terms uſed by the latter Divines; For further Explication, that were not uſed by the firſt Reformers. 5*thly*. I wiſh he had hinted at ſome of the Arguments againſt *Adam's* being a Federal Head, that cannot eaſily be anſwered, and then we ſhould have known his meaning better. It's known that the main Difficulty here turns upon the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to his Poſterity; But if Mr. *Simſon* candidly own the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, in the Senſe all the Reformed Churches do, he gains nothing by denying *Adam* to be a Federal Head, ſo that I wonder what moves him to deny *Adam* to be a Federal Head; I hope he will not deny, but that GOD might have expreſly required *Adam*'s Conſent, and *Adam* being Perfect, could not but conſent (yea, he himſelf does grant, that *Adam* did Conſent) in that caſe *Adam* had certainly been a Federal Head, the Arguments then againſt *Adam*'s being a Federal Head, muſt ariſe not from the Repugnancy of the Thing, but from the Non-exiſtence of the thing, *viz.* only that *Adam* was never a Federal Head: I am ſorry that none of our Divines have yet been able to anſwer the Argu-

ments of *Arminians* on this Head, and that a Profeſſor of Divinity in the Church of *Scotland* ſhould magnifie their Arguments againſt ſuch a material Article of our Doctrine, *viz.* *Adam*'s Federal Headſhip as unanſwerable. *6thly*. It ſeems he is not pleaſed with the ordinary Terms of Divinity, but is better ſatisfied with new ones of his own: I ſhould be glad to hear them, and particularly, what kind of Head he allows *Adam* to have been, and then we ſhall know if his Terms be more agreeable to the *Confeſſion of Faith*; for it ſeems we, are to learn fit Terms from him. Further it ſeems That the Divines who have written after the firſt Reformers, have done great diſſervice to the Truth; for according him, the firſt Reformers have expreſſed our Doctrine concerning the Covenant, *Adam*'s Repreſentation, together with it's Effects, in Terms more agreeable to Scripture and Reaſon, and leſs lyable to Objections, than our latter Divines have done; this is a bold Cenſure indeed, and Dictator like; I apprehend, there is more under it, than he hath thought fit to expreſs, I fear the Divines that compoſed our *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms* will fall under this Cenſure, for they ever call the Covenant of Works a Covenant, and hardly ever a Law, which according to him, is an improper way of ſpeaking, yea, they deſcribe it ſo, as a Body would think it a proper Covenant; and ſo as they ſeem to found the imputation of *Adam*'s Sin upon his Federal Relation: I apprehend, there are more Terms than one in the *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſms*, he is diſpleaſed with.

2 HE denies *Adam* to have been a Federal Head

Head by Vertue of a ſtrict and proper Covenant, *&c.* Now upon this we offer the following Conſiderations, 1*ſt*. According to himſelf, nothing hinders the Covenant of Works from being a proper Covenant, but that we read not of *Adam*'s conſent required and taken; but this was conſidered above. If we can gather it from the Nature of the thing, from Circumſtances and other Scriptures, it is no great Matter, tho' we read not expreſly in the 3 *Chap.* of *Gen*: of *Adam*'s Conſent required and taken. I am ſure it's as eaſy to prove it a proper Covenant, as it is to prove the firſt Promulgation of the Goſpel Covenant to *Adam* to have been a proper Covenant, where we read neither of a Command or Threatning, or Conſent ſought or given, but only of a Promiſe. And yet all Orthodox Divines agree, that this was the Covenant of Grace. 2*dly*. I ſuppoſe Mr. *Simſon* will not deny, but that *Adam* was the Head and Repreſentative of his Poſterity. Now I would know, whether *Adam* was only their Natural Head, or their Federal Head? (For as to what I have heard ſome talk of his being a Moral Head, I take to be a meer Evaſion; For I could never underſtand what they mean by a Moral Head as contradiſtinct from a Natural and Federal Head, and indeed I cannot conceive a midſt betwixt theſe two, ſince his being a Head, muſt be founded either on his Natural Relation, or on a particular Conſtitution appointing him to repreſent them in his Obedience or Diſobedience) if he was only their Natural Head; I ſuppoſe every Body will ſee the groſſneſs of this; For ſo *Adam* repreſented his Poſterity no other way than any private Man does

his Posterity, were it to a Thousand Generations. And therefore he must certainly be their Federal Head, by vertue of a Constitution, appointing him to represent them in that Covenant. 3*dly*. I would know if *Adam* might not have been a Natural Root, and so a Natural Head, without being their publick Head and Representative; if not, then we see clearly his meaning, *viz*. That *Adam* represented his Posterity no other way, than he was their first and Natural Parent: But I suppose this is pretty Gross; For so *Adam* represented his Posterity no other way, than every Man doth his respective Posterity; And so *Adam*'s sin is no otherways imputed, than the sin of every private Man is, to his respective Of-spring.

IF he might have been their natural Head, and yet not represented them; then I want to know what made him a publick Head and Representative? His being their Natural Parent cannot make him their publick Head, as is plain: For so every natural Parent were the publick Head of his Posterity. Will he say, That the Law of his Creation, confirmed with a Threatning makes him this: But this cannot be; for the Law in this Sense might have been given to *Adam*, though he had been, but personally considered. 2*dly*. I would know, whether the Law in this Sense was given to *Adam*, only as the natural Root of his Posterity? And if so, this is a plain overturning of the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin; or if he was considered as more than their natural Parents: This must be by some particular Constitution, which Mr. *Simson* does not allow of. 3*dly*. The Law of his Creation

tion makes him neither one Head or other; but ſuppoſes him put in ſome Capacity either publick or private; under which Conſideration, the Law was preſcribed to him. *4thly.* If *Adam* be not a publick Head, by Vertue of a proper Covenant, I would know whereupon the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin is founded? It muſt either be only upon his being their natural Parent; if ſo, then we have him: For this is a plain denying of the Imputation of his Sin. Or, *2dly.* It muſt be founded upon the Sanction of the Law: But this puts *Adam* in no Capacity, but only ſuppoſes him to be in ſome Capacity or other: Under which Conſideration, the Threatning points at him. *3dly.* It muſt be founded upon the Extent of the Threatning to his Poſterity. If ſo, then (beſides that this doth not put him in any Capacity, but plainly ſuppoſes it) they are either only threatned as Parts of *Adam*, as his Goods and Poſſeſſions; if this be his Meaning, I would think it groſs enough: For this can found no Imputation of Sin to his Poſterity, more than when GOD threatens to puniſh the Sins of Oppreſſors and Idolaters in their Poſterity: For the Poſterity of ſuch, are not thereby guilty before GOD of their Fathers Sins, but only ſuffer as Parts of them; even as when a Man is forfeited for his Rebellion, his Family however innocent, ſuffers thereby. Or, they are threatned only as his natural Deſcendants; but this falls in with the laſt Head, and makes him only a meer natural Head. Or, they are threatned as being under the ſame Obligation with *Adam* to keep the Law given to him

(for

(for the Law cannot properly and directly Threaten any but who are under the Command) now if they were under an Obligation to the preceptive Part of the Law; this muſt be either as they were his natural Deſcendants: But (beſides, That the Law in that Senſe doth not bind them, who yet have no Being at all) it makes him repreſent his Poſterity no other Way, than any other natural Parents. Or *2dly.* They were under the preceptive Part of the Law, as *Adam* was appointed their federal Head and Repreſentative, by a particular Conſtitution, even as a Man repreſents a Community: This is the Truth, but denyed by Mr. *Simſon*; becauſe he ſays, *He does not read it in his Bible.* But, if it can be gathered from the Nature of the Thing, and by good Conſequence from the Scripture: It is no great Matter tho' we read it not expreſly in the Scripture. He himſelf grants, That the *Covenant of Works* had a Promiſe, and that *Adam* did conſent; yet we read as little of any of them expreſly in the Scripture. Now this his being conſtitute by a particular Law, is plain. *1ſt.* Becauſe otherwiſe the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin to his Poſterity, can never be accounted for, without this: Hence we ſee that all who deny the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, deny alſo his being a federal Head, upon this very ſame Account. *2dly.* Becauſe all Mankind are ſaid to have ſinned in him, *Rom:* 5. 12. Now it is plain that they cannot be ſaid to have ſinned in him only as their natural Head: And therefore, it muſt be underſtood, as ſinning in him as their federal Head, which ſuppoſes a par-

parti-

ticular Conſtitution. 3*dly*. *Adam* was the Head of his Poſterity, in the ſame Senſe that the LORD CHRIST was the Head of the Elect, otherwiſe the Foundation of the Imputation of Sin on the one Side, and the Imputation of Righteouſneſs on the other Side, is not the ſame; becauſe different Repreſentations can never found the ſame Kind of Imputation: But it is plain, That the LORD CHRIST was a federal Head of the Elect. 4*thly*. By *Adam*'s Sin we are formally conſtitute Sinners before GOD, and his Sin was in Law-reckoning ours; as if we had ſinned in our own Perſons: As is plain from *Rom:* 5. 19. *By one Man's Diſobedience many were made Sinners.* Now it is plain, That we are conſtitute or made Sinners by *Adam*'s Diſobedience in the ſame Senſe that we are made righteous by Chriſt's Obedience: But it is obvious, That by Chriſt's Obedience we are formally ſiſted righteous before GOD; and that Righteouſneſs reckon'd ours, as if we had perſonally wrought it. And it is plain alſo, That ſuch an Imputation on either Hand, can never be accounted for, without a federal Repreſentation: And therefore if there be a federal Repreſentation with Reference to the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; it muſt be likewiſe ſo, with Reference to the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin. 5*thly*. It is plain, That the Threatning of the *Covenant of Works* pointed at *Adam*'s Poſterity, as well as himſelf: Now if they were threatned only conſidered as his natural Poſterity, there is Nothing peculiar in this Threatning, from what is in other Threatnings denoun-

nounced againſt other ordinary Parents: But all Orthodox Divines own a Speciality in this Threatning, that is never found in any Threatning denounced againſt ordinary natural Parents for their Sins. Beſides, in this Caſe, the Equity of the Threatning can never be accounted for; for ſince the Threatning includes eternal Death, it's hard to ſay, That GOD threatned *Adam*'s Poſterity with eternal Wrath for his Sin, if he was only conſidered as a natural Parent; for this were to threaten the Innocent with eternal Wrath for the Sin of another which is not theirs: For all Orthodox Divines own, That meer natural Relation can never make the Sin of the Parent, the Sin of the Poſterity. And therefore it's plain, That the Threatning muſt extend againſt the Poſterity of *Adam*, conſidered in him as their federal Head. For, there are but two Ways whereby the Sin of another can become ours, *Firſt*, By our partaking perſonally either directly or indirectly in their Sin. Or, 2*dly*. By a legal Repreſentation: And ſince the firſt could have no Place in *Adam*'s ſinning, it muſt certainly be the laſt. Now *Adam*'s Poſterity, not exiſting then, it is plain, they could not commiſſionate him, to repreſent them; and therefore his repreſenting them muſt have been by a particular Conſtitution; the Equity of which appears, from the Conſideration of GOD's abſolute Sovereignity, and from the Poſſibility of the Thing: For it was as eaſie for *Adam* to have kept the Law, for all his Poſterity, as it would have been for his Poſterity to have kept it for themſelves, had they been perſonally to have obeyed; as alſo

ſo, from Chriſt's repreſenting the Elect, in which Repreſentation they had no Hand: All the Difference is, that by Chriſt's Repreſentation, the Salvation of the Elect was infallibly ſecured; whereas by *Adam*'s Repreſentation, Life was only poſſible and Probable to his Poſterity, which never ſtricks againſt the Equity of the Conſtitution.

6. WE read of no Sin of *Adam*'s, imputed to his Poſterity (and it's certain he had actual Sins, after he fell, as well as other Men), but his firſt Sin: As is plain, from *Rom:* 5. 19. Which plainly ſays, That *Adam* ſtood under the ſpecial Relation of a publick Head, with reference to his Poſterity, when he firſt ſinned, which he did not afterwards. Now his natural Relation could not found this Repreſentation: For ſo he had equally repreſented them in his after ſins: And therefore his repreſenting them, muſt be founded on a ſpecial Conſtitution, whereby he was to act, as their federal Head. 7*thly*. and Laſtly. It's plain from the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap*: 6. *Parag*: 3. Where the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, is founded upon his being *the Root of all Mankind*. Now it's obvious, his being the natural Root, cannot found this Imputation: For ſo the ſin of every natural Parent were equally imputable to his Poſterity; and therefore it muſt needs be underſtood of his being a federal Root, which ſuppoſes a particular Conſtitution appointing him ſuch. It's alſo plain, from the Anſwer in the *Shorter Catechiſm*, where it's ſaid, *That the Covenant was made with* Adam, *not only for himſelf, but for his Poſterity*: Where nothing can be plainer, than that *Adam* was there conſtitute the federal Head of his Poſterity.

As

As to the Third Branch, about the imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, there are ſome Poſitions he denies to be his. As, *1ſt.* That Imputation of Sin is nothing elſe but the connexion betwixt the Sin of one, and the Puniſhment or Loſs that another ſuſtains by it; But I would think, that when he Founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin only in the Extent of the Threatning to his Poſterity, and our Natural Relation to him, that according to this Foundation, it would ſeem, that the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin is little elſe, than the Connection betwen his Sin and our Suffering; for it is plain, that neither the extent of our Threatning, nor our Natural Relation to him, can make his Sin ours, or legally chargeable on us, as ours.

A ſecond Poſition he diſowns, is, *That all the Imputation of* Adam's *firſt Sin, is our being corrupted by our Deſcent from* Adam *our Natural Head, by the Law of Generation, as the Effect of his firſt Sin.* This Poſition he likeways diſowns as his; But if all the Imputation of that Sin to us be only founded on our Natural Relation to *Adam*, and the Extent of the Threatning; Then there ſeems to be too much Ground for charging this Poſition upon him: For neither of theſe forementioned Grounds can found the Imputation of ſin, or make *Adam*'s Sin become ours. All that they can lay a Foundation for, is a meer Connection betwen *Adam*'s Sin and our Corruption by Reaſon of it, as is plain to any of but an ordinary Judgment.

A Third Poſition he diſclaims, is, *That the Derivation of Original Sin from* Adam *to his Poſterity, flows meerly from our Partaking of the ſame humane Nature with him.* This he denies as his, and adds

to

to it as the Principal Cauſe of the Derivation of Original Corruption, the Sanction of the Law; But ſeing he alledges, That the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap: 6: Par: 3.* founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin upon the Natural Relation, and not on the Federal (to which he ſays he perfectly agrees) and ſeing there is not one Word of the Sanction of the Law in that *Paragraph*, there ſeems too much Ground to charge this Propoſition upon him; See alſo his Third Letter to Mr. *Rowan*, where he founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin on the Natural Relation, without once mentioning the Sanction of the Law. See theſe following Words, towards the cloſe of that 8 *Pag*: of the foreſaid Letters, where he ſays, *If the Word* Covenant *be taken improperly, then they will agree, Natural Relation being ſufficient to found the Imputation of Parents Guilt to their Poſterity, in breaking many Laws even among Men.* It's true he ſays in the Words immediately following, *That this Imputation flows alſo from the Sanction of the Law*, But they ſeem to Contradict the former Words: For if Natural Relation be ſufficient to found Imputation of Sin, there is no great occaſion for the Sanction of the Law; ſince by vertue of the Natural Relation, that Sin would have been imputed to us, tho' the Sanction had not been added. It's alſo very falſe, that Natural Relation in the Courts of Men, founds the Imputation of the Parents Sin to their Poſterity: For ſo the Father being Guilty of Rebellion, the Son were alſo legally Guilty of Rebellion, which were hard, and is never allowed in any well ordered Government, if it be not among the *Mahumetans*. Children may indeed ſuffer Poverty and

and Disgrace by their Father's Rebellion; but it were unjust to Execute the Law against Rebels upon the Children, which according to Mr. *Simson* might be justly done, if the Natural Relation did make Children guilty of their Parents Rebellion. If this Doctrine of Mr. *Simson*'s do not justify the cruelty of Tyrants in cutting off the Posterity for the Rebellion of the Father's, any may judge.

A Fourth Position he refuseth, *Pag:* 177, 178. is, *That there is only such an Imputation of* Adam's *Sin to his Posterity, as is often of our immediate Parents Faults to us.* This Proposition (by way of Explication) he denies to be his, either as to Words or Sense; yet he owns, *That some Sins of immediate Parents are formally and Properly imputed to their Posterity, as well and as truly, as* Adam's *first Sin is to all his Posterity.* 2*dly.* He Confesseth, *That the Effects and Properties of the Imputation of* Adam's *Sin to his Posterity, do vastly differ from the Effects and Properties of the Imputation of the Sins of immediate Parents to their Posterity*; Which difference he says, *ariseth from the different Sanction of the Laws, and different Punishments therein threatned, according to which, the Sin of* Adam, *and the Sins of immediate Parents are imputed, and the Posterity of* Adam *and Children of other Parents are thereby made liable to Punishments of a different Nature, Extent and Duration,* &c. *as the Sanction from which the several Punishments flow, do appoint.* In both which cases, he says, *the Imputation is formal and proper*, and cites *Turret: Loc:* 9. *Quæst:* 9. in his 3. *Argument.* But let any judge if he own indeed any other Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin to his Posterity, than what is of any other Parents Sins to their Posterity

rity, for he hath juſt now ſaid, *That the Sins of other Parents are formally and properly imputed to their Poſterity, as truly and as well, as* Adam's *firſt Sin was to his Poſterity, and that in both Caſes, the Imputation is formal and proper* Now all ſound Divines own, That never a Parent's Sin was imputed to his Poſterity as *Adam*'s was. 2*dly*. The Extent of the Sanction with Reference to the Puniſhments threatned, make only a circumſtantial Difference, the Imputation is ſtill the ſame in both Caſes. 3*dly*. Will he ſay, That the Sins of Oppreſſors, Murderers, and Idolaters are as formally imputed to their Poſterity (for the threatnings in the Scripture extend, even to the Poſterity of ſuch) as *Adam*'s Sin is to his Poſterity ? Can they be ſaid to have committed Idolatry, *&c.* when their Parents did ſo ? or are they truly chargeable with theſe Sins as their's before GOD, as we are chargable with *Adam*'s firſt Sin, and did Sin, *and ſo Eat the forbidden Fruit in him, Rom*: 5. 12. *&* 19 4*thly*. He founds the Imputation of Sin chiefly upon the Sanction of the Law, but not upon *Adam*'s repreſenting his Poſterity as a publick Perſon, in which he ſwerves both from the Scripture, *Rom*. 5. 12, 19. and from the *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms* : Never Orthodox Divine but himſelf, founded it upon the Sanction, that I know of ; So that Imputation of Sin according to him, is nothing but a being made liable to the Puniſhment threatned : For all the extending of the Sanction can do, is a ſubjecting them to the Puniſhment, which is not what we call *Imputatio Culpæ*, but only *Pœnæ* ; So that it's plain, that according to him, to impute Sin and to puniſh for it, are the ſame, as is further plain from

from his Third Letter to Mr. *Rowan*, *Pag*: 9. *Line* 6. where he ſays, *That Sin is imputed to him that Suffers that Puniſhment, whether he committed the Fact or not*, ſo that he owns no more than *Arminians* do, for they ſay, We ſuffer the Puniſhment of *Adam*'s Sin, and ſo found it as Mr. *Simſon* does in the Natural Relation, to which Foundation Profeſſor *Simſon* ſays, he perfectly agrees; only they deny this to be a formal Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, in which they are more in the Right than Mr. *Simſon*. See *Limburg*: *Lib*: 3*tio*. *Cap*: 3*tio*. § 7. 5*thly*. As to the Teſtimony cited out of *Turret*: *Loc*: 9. *Queſt*: 9. *Pag*. 683. Its true his Third Argument wherewith he proves the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, is, Becauſe the Sins of immediate Parents are oft times imputed to their Poſterity. But it's plain, he is arguing from the leſs to the greater, and he cannot be ſaid to think, that the Sins of immediate Parents are imputed to their Children, in the ſame formal Senſe, in which *Adam*'s Sin is, as is plain from *Turretines* own Words, where *Pag*: 679. he ſays, The Foundation of the imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, is not only our partaking the ſame Nature with him, becauſe otherways all his Sins would be imputed to us; but chiefly his Moral and Federal Relation, by which GOD made a Covenant with him as our Head; So that *Adam* in that Sin was not a private, but publick Perſon, and did repreſent his Poſterity in that Action, as alſo from his Fifth Argument, wherewith he proves the imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, *viz*. Becauſe *Adam* was the Root of his Poſterity not in a Natural but moral and repreſentative Senſe, whereby he Covenanted for himſelf and for his Poſterity, *&c*. can

any

any thing be more oppoſite to Mr. *Simſon's* Doctrine, ſo that it is reaſonable to Explain this third Argument in a Conſiſtency, to what he founds the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin upon.

A fifth Propoſition he diſowns, is, *That there is no proper, and formal Imputation of* Adam's *firſt Sin, to his Poſterity:* As alſo, that he denies, *Reatus Peccati Adæ; and that all the Imputation of* Adam's *Sin is only, that by Occaſion thereof, we fall into Miſery:* This he denies to be his; and hath a long Anſwer thereto, *Pag:* 179, to 184: But what is material therein, will fall to be conſidered, when he delivers his poſitive Judgment, about the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin, which follows.

Here he delivers his Judgment, *Pag:* 184. about the Imputation of *Adam's* firſt Sin. *And* 1ſt. *He thinks Dr:* Owen's *Definition of the Imputation of Sin very good, in his Book* on Juſtification, Chap: 7: Pag: 234. *Wherefore to impute Sin, is to lay it to the Charge of any, and to deal with them according to its Deſert:* To which he adds his own Definition, as much the ſame, *viz. To impute Sin to a Perſon, is to charge him with Guilt, or, as lyable to Puniſhment, according to the Sanction of the Law, for Sin committed by himſelf, or another, againſt the preceptive Part of it.* 2*dly.* So according to him, to impute Sin to *Adam's* Poſterity, is to charge them with the Guilt thereof, and to adjudge them as lyable to the Puniſhment for it, according to the Sanction of the *Law of Works.* Or, 3*dly.* It's to lay his Sin to their Charge, and deal with them, according to it's Deſert, as the Sanction of the Law appoints.

2. He thinks all Imputation of Sin by GOD, proper

proper, formal and juſt, being perſwaded, that he always imputes ſin, according to the righteous Sanction of the Law, whether he imputes it to thoſe that tranſgreſs or others: And he thinks it a Reflection on the Wiſdom and Juſtice of GOD, to imagine, that he imputes ſin any other Way than properly, or that any afflictive Evil can follow, from the Sanction of his Law accidentaly, or beſide his Deſign: And ſays, *That this agrees to* Rom: 5. 12, 13, *&c. where the Imputation of* Adam's *Sin is expreſly founded upon a Law, not upon a Covenant.* And further adds, *That this Way, it's eaſie to anſwer the great Difficulty upon this Head,* viz, *How it is agreeable to the Juſtice and Goodneſs of GOD, to add ſuch a Sanction to his Law, that threatens ſuch a Puniſhment, which if upon* Adam's *firſt ſin, ſhould be inflicted, would neceſſarly involve, not only* Adam, *who perſonally ſinned; but likewiſe all his Poſterity in ſin, and Miſery:* To which his Anſwer is, *That it being evident from Scripture and Experience; that GOD hath done ſo, it muſt needs be agreeable to his infinite Wiſdom, Juſtice and Goodneſs, tho' we cannot explain the Manner how this is agreeable to them.*

AND laſtly adds, *That this Anſwer cannot be given to ſuch Difficulties, as preſs any human Hypotheſis; becauſe in that caſe, it is not manifeſt, that GOD has done what is ſuppoſed. And Men are ready to ſuppoſe, That GOD hath done, or may do things, that are really inconſiſtent with his Juſtice, Goodneſs and other Perfections.*

LET us a little conſider thir things, *Firſt,* In general, if the ſins of immediate Parents be as formally and properly imputed to their Poſterity, as *Adam's*

Adam's Sin was to his; then they muſt needs ſtand in the ſame Capacity for their Poſterity, that *Adam* ſtood in for his, *viz:* of a publick Head and Repreſentative; which he ſeems to own *Adam* was, there is no Difference in the Nature of the Repreſentation, only in the Extent of the Threatning, and the Number, and Kinds of Evils threatened, which do no way alter the Nature of the Repreſentation: Becauſe the Ground of the Imputation of Sin, according to Mr. *Simſon* in both caſes, is the ſame, *viz:* the Sanction of the Law: But I ever thought, That never Man repreſented his Poſterity, ſo as *Adam* did his: From which it is plain, that he denies the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin, in the Senſe in which all Orthodox Divines do own it.

2. As to the Deſcription of the Imputation of Sin, given by Dr. *Owen*, and adduced by Profeſſor *Simſon*; it's plain he makes two Branches of it: 1*ſt*. A laying Sin to one's Charge, in which the formal Nature of Imputation conſiſts. 2*dly*. A dealing with him accordingly, which is the Effect of the other; the firſt Mr. *Simſon* waves in his Anſwer to the fifth Propoſition. And to ſhew, how little Dr. *Owen* makes for him: I ſhall cite a Paſſage or two out of the ſame Book, *Pag*: 235. where he deſcribes the Imputation of what is not ours perſonally, *to be a making, that to be ours by Imputation, which was not ours before, unto all the Ends and Purpoſes, whereunto it would have ſerved, had it been our own, without any ſuch Imputation*, &c. Again, *Pag*: 136. Where ſpeaking of four Ways, whereby what is not ours, becomes ours by Imputation: The *firſt* Way he names is, *ex Juſtitia*,

and names two Branches of it; the firſt only I name, his Words are, *Things done by one, may be imputed to others,* propter Relationem fœderalem, *becauſe of a Covenant Relation betwixt them; ſo the Sin of* Adam *was, and is imputed to all his Poſterity*: Where he expreſly founds the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin on his federal Relation. How Dr: *Owen's* Deſcription of the Imputation of Sin, ſhould favour his Opinion, may ſeem ſtrange.

3. As to the Deſcription of Imputation, which he gives in his own Words, it's plain he makes Imputation of Sin, to be nothing elſe, but *charging one with Guilt, or Lyableneſs to Puniſhment, according to the Sanction of the Law.* From whence we may notice, 1*ſt.* That he makes not Imputation to be a charging with the Sin it ſelf; but only with a Liableneſs to Puniſhment: And ſo by Guilt, he does not underſtand the Sin's firſt becoming theirs; but only a Liableneſs to Puniſhment. 2*dly.* That he founds the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin, not on his repreſenting them, as a publick Head; but on the Sanction of the Law; but the Threatning of the Law could not make him ſuch, but plainly ſuppoſeth the Capacity, under which he was threatned, as is plain from *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap.* 6. §. 3. Where the Imputation of his Sin is founded intirely, upon his being, *the Root of all Mankind,* and not upon the Sanction, which even taking *ROOT,* for a natural Root, is contrary to what he chiefly founds the Imputation of *Adam's* Sin upon, *viz.* the Sanction of the Law, And ſince it's plain, That *Adam's* being a natural Root, cannot found the Imputation of his Sin, *Root* muſt needs be taken for a federal Root.

3. It is true, That all Imputation of Sin by GOD is proper and formal: But the Queſtion is, Whether Imputation of Sin, as explained by Mr. *Simſon*, be proper and formal? Which we have in Part ſhewed is not, and ſhall further (the LORD aſſiſting) ſhew, that it is not. 2*dly*. How little Countenance *Rom*: 5. 12, 13, *&c.* gives to his new Doctrine, we have already hinted: For, if in that Place, the Imputation be founded on a Law, not on a Covenant; then the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is founded alſo on a Law and not upon his repreſenting them, by Vertue of the Covenant of Redemption; then the Covenant of Grace, is a meer Law, and not a proper Covenant: And further the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is founded, not upon his repreſenting them in his Obedience; but upon the Promiſe made to him in Contemplation of his Obedience, even as according to Mr. *Simſon* the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin is founded upon the Sanction of the Law. 3*dly*. How Mr. *Simſon*'s Scheme removes the Difficulty againſt the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, any may judge: For tho' GOD's having added ſuch a Sanction to the Covenant of Works, whereby eternal Wrath was theatned, not only to *Adam*, but to his Poſterity, muſt needs be inflict; becauſe he has done it: Yet, if the Threatning be either the only or chief Foundation of the Imputation of his Sin to them, it would be hard to reconcile it either with his Wiſdom or his Juſtice; not with his Wiſdom, becauſe the Threatning, cannot make any guilty of Sin; but ſuppoſes the breach of the Command, as the Foundation why the Threatning takes place upon him;

Not with the Juſtice of GOD, becauſe a Number of innocent Perſons who could have no hand in *Adam*'s Sin, nor ſinned, either perſonally or in *Adam* as their Federal Repreſentative, are ſubjected to the ſame Puniſhment with *Adam*, viz. eternal Wrath. 4*thly*. It diſcovers Mr. *Simſon*'s great Confidence to call *Adam*'s federal Repreſentation an humane Hypotheſis, ſince 'tis ſo clearly founded in the Word, in the *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſms*, and aſſerted by Orthodox Divines as we particularly ſhewed out of Doctor *Owen*. 5*ly*. We have already proven, That *Adam* was conſtituted a federal Repreſentative of his Poſterity. 6*ly*. The Anſwer to the Difficulty againſt the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin is more eaſy and plain from the federal way; For *Adam's* being conſtitute their federal Head; makes his Poſterity in a Conſiſtency with Juſtice chargable with his Sin as their's, and ſo them juſtly liable to the puniſhment. And any body may ſee, that it's more agreeable to GOD's Wiſdom and Juſtice to appoint *Adam* a federal Head of his Poſterity, whereby in Law they become guilty before GOD, and ſo juſtly puniſhable; than ſuppoſing the Command only concerned *Adam* perſonally conſidered, to extend the Threatning equally to his Poſterity, which neither can found the Imputation of his Sin to the Propagation of Original ſin to them, ſeing the Sanction of the Law, can never make them be conſidered as Sinners, whereby they bring this Corruption upon themſelves, ſo that it can only be conſidered this Way, as a ſimple Miſery; beſides, that they are thereby ſubjected to original Corruption and the Wrath of GOD, before they be conſidered as ſinners; For it's not the threatning, but

the tranſgreſſing of the Command that makes Men Sinners.

E'RE we come further to conſider his deſcription of the Imputation of ſin, and of what he founds it upon; We ſhall lay down ſome Conſiderations on this Head: *1ſt.* That Imputation of ſin, is a charging the ſin it ſelf upon a Man as really his ſin; This we conceive is plain from *Rom.* 5. 12, 19. *2dly.* That Imputation of ſin is twofold, *1ſt.* Of a Man's own ſin Perſonally committed by him. *2dly.* There is the Imputation of ſin committed by another. *3dly.* That the ſin of another can be charged upon a Man, but two Ways. *1ſt.* As he Perſonally conſented to it, or ſome way concurred with him in the ſin, or approved of it. *2dly.* Or as he was ſome way Repreſented by that other Perſon.

4. THAT one can Repreſent another but two ways, *1ſt.* By the Man's own chuſing him as his Repreſentative in ſuch an Action, and conſenting that the Action of the other, whether good or bad be imputed to him, or by the Appointment of a Superior that has full Power over both for that end. Now that GOD had full Power this way, and might juſtly appoint *Adam* as the Federal Repreſentative of his Poſterity, I hope no ſound Proteſtant will controvert.

5. THAT a ſimple natural Relation of a Parent, can never make a Man Repreſent, his Poſterity, ſo as to found a Legal Imputation of his ſin to them. *1ſt.* Becauſe he himſelf acknowledges, *That* Adam *might have been a natural Parent without the Imputation of his ſin to his Poſterity.* *2dly.* Becauſe ſo, not only all the other ſins of *Adam*; but

but alſo all the ſins of our intermediate Parents ſince *Adam*, were in the ſame Senſe imputable to us. 3*dly*. Becauſe he himſelf founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin chiefly upon the Sanction of the Law.

6. WE are to diſtinguiſh betwixt *Imputatio culpæ*; This is founded upon the Breach of the Command by *Adam*, as our Federal Head, by which we ſinned, and fell in him. And *Imputatio pœnæ*, or a Legal lyableneſs to the Puniſhment: This is founded upon the Sanction of the Law annexed to the Command, and reſpecting *Adam* as a Publick Head, as well as the Command did.

7. THAT the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to his Poſterity, ſuppoſes his ſin to have been really their's: For no Action whether good or bad, can be imputed to a Man, unleſs it be ſuppoſed to be his, ſome way before the Imputation, otherwiſe the Imputation is not true, and wants a Foundation, and GOD's imputing *Adam*'s ſin to us being juſt, muſt needs ſuppoſe his ſin to be ours; and for this there is a real Foundation: For the Party Repreſenting and Repreſented making but one Party in Law, the ſin thereby becomes common to both. The Imputation indeed legally evicts and finds this ſin to be ours; but this ſtill ſuppoſes that the ſin is ours before it be imputed.

8. THAT when Children ſuffer for their Parents ſin, as Parents are oftimes threatned this way, there is no proper Imputation of the Parents ſin to their Children, unleſs they have conſented thereto (of which their Children yet unborn are not capable) for neither a meer natural Re-

Relation, nor the Sanction of the Law can found a formal and proper Imputation, as is plain. Will any ſay, that the Children of Idolaters, and Murderers yet unborn, are really guilty before GOD (when they come to exiſt) of the Idolatry of their Parents, as we are guilty before GOD of *Adam*'s ſin; nor is their ſuffering a proper Puniſhment, in regard of the Children, the Puniſhment formally reſpects the Parents; but in regard of the Children it's meer ſuffering, and they ſuffer this way as Pieces, and Poſſeſſions of their Parents, even as when a Man becomes poor, by his miſmanagement, his Family ſuffers with him, yet they are not therefore guilty of his ſquandering: Thus GOD may ſubject Children to Temporal Judgments for the ſins of their Parents, but not to Eternal Puniſhment, this we conceive is not ſo agreeable to GOD's Juſtice.

Now we proceed to conſider Mr. *Simſon*'s Doctrine of the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin; And *1ſt*. I would know what he means, by the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin; for either it is only their being obnoxious and lyable to Wrath; but this is no Imputation of ſin at all, as is plain, but the Conſequence of it, and what they call *Imputatio Pœnæ*, and ſuppoſeth it, nor could they be lyable to ſuch a Puniſhment, unleſs the ſin were firſt ſome way their's: Beſides, this is what *Arminians* own, only they make it a meer Conſequence of the natural Relation, and he founds it chiefly on the Extent of the Threatning, or it's a Legal Reckoning, and charging *Adam*'s ſin upon them, as their ſin, though they never Perſonally commit-

ted

ted it, as the *Catechiſms* do hold forth, while they deſcribe the firſt Branch of Man's ſinful ſtate to conſiſt in the Guilt of *Adam*'s firſt ſin; but this can never be accounted for, unleſs *Adam* be conſidered as a Federal Head: Beſides, it's plain, he does not own the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, in this Senſe; For, 1*ſt*. He confounds the charging of *Adam*'s ſin on us, with our being liable to the Puniſhment. 2*dly*. He founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, partly upon the natural Relation, and chiefly upon the Extent of the Sanction, neither of which can found the Imputation of his ſin; Beſides I never heard of any Divine, who maintains the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, in the common Senſe of all Proteſtants, who founded it upon the Threatning, and not upon his being their Repreſentative.

2. I would know upon what the Imputation of this ſin to *Adam* himſelf is bottomed; It muſt certainly be, what does make him a ſinner before GOD, and that is his breaking the Command: For ſin, and conſequently the Imputation of it hath an immediate Relation to the Violation of the Command, and therefore the Foundation of the Imputation of that ſin to us, muſt be our being conſidered as having ſome way broken the Command, unleſs we ſay, that the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to himſelf, is founded upon his breaking the Command, and that the Imputation of that ſin to his Poſterity, is founded upon the Threatning, which is ſtrange; For this makes them two different Imputations, the Grounds of the ſeveral Imputations being different: Beſides, that the Threatning does not, make

make any a Sinner, but ſuppoſeth him to be ſuch; yea, it's contrar to good Senſe; for ſin being a Tranſgreſſion of the Law, what founds the Imputation of ſin to any, muſt be his having ſome way Tranſgreſſed the Preceptive Part of the Law; it's this founds *Imputatio Culpæ*, as the Threatning, does what they call *Imputatio Pœnæ*; for ſin immediately reſpects the Command, as a Violation thereof, as Puniſhment does the Threatning, as the immediate Foundation of liableneſs thereto.

3. I would know, what is the Ground of the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to his Poſterity, it muſt either be his Repreſenting them as a Federal Head, but this, though the Truth, he ſtifly denys, and impugns, or his being their Natural Root: But this cannot be, as we ſhewed before. Beſides that he himſelf expreſly founds this Imputation, chiefly upon the Threatning, though at other Times he ſays, he perfectly agrees with this Bottom of Imputation, as we remarked formerly, or it is the Sanction with the Extent thereof, this is that which he chiefly grounds the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin upon, but this cannot be.

BECAUSE, 1*ſt*. The Sanction can never make *Adam*'s ſin their's, nor conſequently found the Imputation of it to them; it may indeed ſubject them to Miſeries, but can never make his ſin their's; for the Threatning being to confirm the Command ſuppoſeth the Breach thereof, in all, againſt whom it ſtricks as a Threatning. 2*dly*. Becauſe the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to his Poſterity, and of other Parents to their Reſpective Poſterity, differ nothing in Nature, but only in the Extent of the Threatning, and the Number

of

of the Evils threatned: But this overturns the Doctrine of Imputation, as is plain; for all Proteſtants own that never any Man's ſins were ſo imputed to his Poſterity as *Adam*'s ſin was. And *3dly*. So the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin is nothing but their lyableneſs to Puniſhment by Reaſon of the Threatning, for the Sanction can found no more. *4thly*. Under what capacity was *Adam* threatned, (for the Threatning ſuppoſes him under ſome Capacity or other) he will not allow him to have been conſidered a Federal Head, and therefore he muſt in the Threatning be conſidered as a Natural Root and Parent: But this obviouſly deſtroys the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin; for his being their Natural Parent can never make his ſin their's, as we ſhewed before. *5thly*. I would know how *Adam*'s Poſterity were conſidered in the Threatning: For either *1ſt*. They were conſidered as ſome way under the Command in *Adam* as their Federal Head; but this he calls an Humane Hypotheſis, and inconſiſtent with the Divine Perfections. Or, *2dly*. They were conſidered ſimply as *Adam*'s Natural Deſcendants; But this can found no ſpecial Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, more than of the ſins of Natural Parents to their Reſpective Poſterity. Or, *3dly*. They were conſidered as *Adam*'s Goods and Poſſeſſion: And if ſo, then the Puniſhment was only threatned to *Adam*, and they only ſuffered by the by, as Parts of *Adam*, as a Man's Family ſuffers with him when he falls under Diſgrace, and ſo it's only a Miſery and not a Puniſhment in Regard of his Poſterity; For the Threatning being annexed as a Puniſhment to the breaking of the Com-

Command; as ſuch, can only ſtrick againſt them who are under the Command and break it. Now *Adam*'s Poſterity cannot be ſaid to have been under the Command, but by being conſidered in *Adam* as a Federal Head.

6. IF this be all the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, *viz.* a charging of his Poſterity as liable to Wrath, according to the Sanction of the Law; Then GOD threatens Wrath to an infinite Number of Perſons that are innocent for the Sin of another (for the Threatning can no Way make *Adam*'s Sin theirs) and accordingly ſubjects them to the Puniſhment, when in the mean Time they had no Acceſs to *Adam*'s Sin; but that when he was threatned, they were threatned in him; which they could no more hinder than their being repreſented in him. This plainly reflects upon GOD's Juſtice; unleſs they be conſidered as repreſented, and ſo ſinning in him: For it's a ſubjecting innocent Perſons to the Curſe; and if they be conſidered as Sinners, or capable to ſin, when *Adam* was threatned; this deſtroys his Notion of the Imputation of Sin.

7. THIS is plain from *Rom*: 5. 12. That the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, does not conſiſt in their being chargeable as obnoxious to the Puniſhment: For this plainly ſuppoſes the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin; becauſe the ſinning of all in *Adam*, is there given, as a Thing diſtinct from, and as the Reaſon of their being liable to Death.

8. IT's plain from *Rom*: 5. 18, 19. Where we have *Vers.* 18. That wherein Mr. *Simſon* places the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, *viz.* a Liableneſs

to

to Puniſhment, by one Man's Offence Judgment came upon all Men to Condemnation. And *Ver*: 19. We have the Cauſe of this, *viz.* their being made or conſtitute Sinners by one Man's Offence, where we may notice, *Firſt*, The true Nature of Imputation; their being made, or legally found and declared Sinners, which is a Thing different from, and ſuppos'd to, liableneſs to Puniſhment; wherein Mr. *Simſon* places the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin. 2*dly*. We may notice, that he founds their being made Sinners not on the Sanction, but upon the Trangreſſion of the preceptive Part of the Law, *viz.* the Offence, and that of one Man, which being emphatick, points out the publick Capacity under which *Adam* ſinned; and conſequently, That his Sinning in that Capacity is the Ground why all Men are made Sinners, or have *Adam*'s Sin imputed to them: As is clear from the oppoſite Branch, by one Man's Obedience, &c. Which plainly points out Chriſt's being a federal Head as the Foundation of the Elect's being made righteous

9. IF the Sanction be the chief Ground of the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, then this is only *Imputatio quoad pœnam* i. e. a being made liable to Puniſhment by Reaſon of *Adam*'s Sin: For the Sanction can never found the Imputation of Sin, or make *Adam*'s Sin ours, unleſs we ſay, That the Grounds of imputing *Adam*'s Sin to him and to us are different, *viz.* as to *Adam* his breaking the Command, and as to us, the extending of the Sanction to us; which is ſtrange and a real Denyal of the Imputation of Sin. 2*dly*

Then

Then the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is founded not on his repreſenting the Elect as their Head; But on the Promiſe of a Reward made to him, in view of his Obedience and Suffering. 3*dly*. Then the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs will be nothing elſe, but an adjudging of a Believer to Glory, as having a Right to eternal Life, by Vertue of the Promiſe of Reward made to the Mediator; but not an imputing of the Righteouſneſs it ſelf to us as ours: which is a plain denyal of the Imputation of that Righteouſneſs; and is what *Arminians* themſelves allow. And he ſays, *That Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is imputed to us in the very ſame Senſe, in which* Adam's *Sin is imputed:* See *Pag*: 272. *of his Defences.* Laſtly, In his third Letter to Mr. *Rowan*, he anſwers not this Inference drawn by *Rowan*, concerning the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, only aſſerts in Words; but is not pleaſed to tell what he means by it.

PAGE: 186. Of his Defences, he ſays, *That the Notion of a* proper Covenant, *wherein* Adam *for himſelf and his Poſterity, undertook, contributes nothing at all to remove Difficulties brought againſt the Juſtice of GOD, in imputing* Adam's *Sin to them: On the contrary he ſays, it rather gives Occaſion to new Difficulties: for by his being their natural Parent, he had no Right to engage in their Name, and ſo could not oblige them; wherefore the Favourers of this Opinion (as he ſpeaks) are forced to ſuppoſe, That by ſome divine Conſtitution, he was appointed to act and tranſact in their Name.* But to this he ſays, *That there is no ſuch Clauſe in the* Law of Creation *or* Covenant of Works *given*

ven to Adam, *and that ſuch a Conſtitution, would have been prior to the Covenant made with* Adam, *and diſtinct from it*; which Conſtitution, he ſays, *he has not as yet ſeen proven.*

HERE we may ſee him very open and plain. And *firſt*, Divines generally give this Reaſon, why we have no more expreſly recorded concerning the *Covenant of Works*; becauſe it was not deſigned as a ſtanding Way of Life, but as a Prologue to uſher in the *Covenant of Grace*; and that we are to gather it's Nature from other Places of Scripture, compared with the 3. of *Gen.* 2*dly*. It ſeems ſtrange That *Adam*'s being a Federal Head of his Poſterity, ſhould not only, not remove Difficulties, as to the Juſtice of the Imputation of his Sin to his Poſterity; but rather increaſe them: Sure Mr. *Simſon* in this Notion ſtands alone, as he does alſo, in what he founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin upon; for is not the very grand Reaſon, why *Arminians* and *Socinians* deny *Adam* to have been a federal Head, upon this very Account; becauſe it plainly and naturally founds this Imputation. 3*dly*. We read as little of a Promiſe expreſly made to *Adam*; or that the Threatning reſpected his Poſterity, as well as himſelf, and that *Adam* did conſent; and yet Mr. *Simſon* acknowledges all theſe three: Might not a *Socinian* the ſame Way ſay, That only *Adam* was theatned, not his Poſterity, and that the Miſeries they fall under are only the Conſequents of natural Generation. 4*thly*. Sure it is as agreeable to Juſtice, to appoint *Adam* a federal Repreſentative of his Poſterity, whereby there is a legal and juſt Imputation of his Sin unto them,

as

as ſuppoſing that the Command concerned *Adam* only perſonally conſidered; to extend the Threatning equally to his Poſterity with himſelf, whereby an infinite Number of innocent Perſons, are ſubjected to eternal Wrath, that cannot be conſidered as Sinners: For it is plain, That the extending of the Threatning to *Adam*'s Poſterity can never found the Imputation of his Sin to them, or make them legally Sinners: For ſo the Children of Idolaters, Oppreſſors, *&c.* were as really guilty of the Idolatry and Oppreſſion of their Parents, as we are guilty of *Adam*'s Sin. 5*thly*. It is true, That *Adam*'s being a natural Parent, could not lay a Foundation, for his being their federal Head; but is it not plain, that it can as little found the Imputation of his Sin, to his Poſterity? to which Foundation of Imputation Mr. *Simſon* elſe where ſays, *He perfectly agrees*, when he alledges that *Parag*: 3. *Chap*: 6. of the *Confeſſion*, founds the Imputation of Sin on the Natural, not on the federal Relation: And we would mark, that that *Paragraph* ſpeaks not one Word of the Sanction; ſo that according to Mr. *Simſon*'s Gloſs, the *Confeſſion of Faith* founds this Imputation intirely upon the natural Relation. 6*thly*. We have already fully proven, That *Adam* was conſtitute a federal Head; as alſo the Equity of that Conſtitution; but it ſeems Mr. *Simſon* not only denies, That there was ſuch a Conſtitution, but alſo the Conſiſtency of it with Divine Juſtice, which beſide the plain Groſneſs of the Thing would give a Perſon Ground to ſuſpect, That Mr. *Simſon*, as yet has not fully opened his Mind upon this Subject.

A-

AGAIN, He ſays in the ſame 186 *Pag:* of his Defences, *That ſuppoſing GOD had made ſuch a Conſtitution, that then, the ſuppoſing GOD made a proper Covenant is altogether needleſs: Becauſe by that Conſtitution, all* Adam's *Management, whether good or bad, was equally in his own and Poſterity's Name, and ſo is all one whether he tranſgreſſed a Law, or a Covenant:* But the end of this Conſtitution of *Adam* as a Publick Head, being in order to make a Covenant with him under that Capacity: A Covenant thereupon could not but follow, as a Covenant with him under that Capacity, neceſſarly ſuppoſes ſuch a Conſtitution, as Fundamental to his acting under that Capacity.

2. IT behoved to be more than a ſimple Law, becauſe a ſimple Law could never found the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to his Poſterity, as is plain. *3dly.* According to this Argument, Chriſt's being once conſtituted the Publick Repreſentative of the Elect, a Covenant with him under that Capacity was needleſs, which is abſurd. *4thly.* He adds in that 186 *page* and 187. That ſuppoſing ſuch a Conſtitution, is attended with this conſiderable Difficulty, *viz.* That *Adam* had thereby been placed in the Relation of a Tutor *Dative* to his Poſterity by GOD the righteous Sovereign over him and them, who both knew, and alſo deſigned, that *Adam* ſhould miſmanage. Now ſays he, *According to all Rules of Juſtice and Equity known among men, the Faults of ſuch Repreſentatives are ſo far from being imputed to the Pupils repreſented, that on the contrary whatever Loſs and Damage they ſuſtain by their Tutors miſmanagement would be imputeable to the Tutor, and he would*

would be obliged to repair it; and in caſe of his Inability to repair it, they would be allowed to ſeek Redreſs from the Magiſtrate, who appointed him, and knew at the Time he would certainly miſmanage. But, 1*ſt.* This ſeems to be an *Arminian* Argument; For it ſavours much of their bitter and *Sarcaſtical* Spirit; whether Mr *Simſon* hath read this in ſome *Arminian* Author, I cannot tell. 2*dly.* I obſerve, That he not only impungs *Adam's* being a federal Head and Repreſentative, but alſo the Equity and Conſiſtency thereof with Divine Wiſdom and Juſtice; So that according to this Argument of Mr *Simſon's*, GOD could not in Juſtice appoint *Adam* a federal Head, nor make a Covenant with him under that Capacity. How deep this runs any may judge; And I ſuppoſe Mr *Simſon* will find no *Divines* of the ſame Judgment with him in this, except *Arminians* or Arminianiſing Divines. 3*dly.* This ſame Difficulty ſtands in as full Force againſt Mr *Simſon's* Scheme: For when GOD extended the Threatning denounced againſt *Adam* to his Poſterity, he knew, and, as he courſely phraſes it, *deſigned Adam ſhould miſmanage.* Now let him explain the Equity of that Threatning denounced againſt his innocent Poſterity who were never guilty, either in themſelves, or in *Adam*, becauſe not repreſented by him as their federal Head, and who thereby were involved in the univerſal Corruption of their Nature, and ſo rendred impotent to do any Thing that was good, *&c.* 4*thly.* His *Simile* is weak: For Tutors do not repreſent their Pupils, as that the Actions of the Tutors are really and in Law the Deeds of the Pupils; For ſo the Miſmanagements

of the Tutors were really imputable to the Pupils themſelves, as it is in *Adam*'s Repreſenting of Mankind, whereby his Sin is really ours, ſo that the *Simile* manifeſtly halts. 5*thly*. If a Tutor miſmanage, in that caſe the Magiſtrate is not purſuable for Redreſs, but the Tutor: Indeed, if the Magiſtrate know, That the Tutor will miſmanage, he is purſuable in that Caſe: But this is not to be ſuppoſed amongſt Men, at leaſt in Judgment of Charity. Now will Mr. *Simſon* apply this to the great GOD, that becauſe when a Magiſtrate appoints a Tutor, who, he knows, will miſmanage, and is therefore culpable and purſuable; that therefore GOD is chargeable with *Adam*'s Miſmanagement, becauſe he not only appointed *Adam* a federal Head, but knew certainly he would miſmanage. This Argument ſtricks plainly againſt the antecedent and infallible Decree, and ſo is entirely *Arminian*: For ſo they Argue againſt the Decree the ſame way, *viz.* That GOD has threatened Men with Damnation if they Believe not when yet he not only fore-knows, That they would not Believe, but had by his Decree (to uſe Mr. *Simſon*'s Phraſe) deſigned they ſhould not Believe. This Argument would Tempt one to Queſtion Mr. *Simſon*'s Sincerity in owning the antecedent and infallible Decree.

NOw let any Compare the two Schemes together, and judge which of them is moſt agreeable to Scripture, and hangs beſt together. We ſay, That the Covenant of Works was a proper Covenant. He ſays, *It was only a Law.* We ſay, That *Adam* was a Federal Head. He ſays *That he was only a Natural Root or Head.* We ſay, That the Im-

Imputation of his Sin is founded on his Federal Repreſentation. He founds it, *partly on the Natural Relation, and chiefly on the extent of the Sanction.* We ſay, That the Imputation of his ſin is a charging of his act of ſinning upon us as Legally ours, He ſays, *it is only a charging us with a Liableneſs to the Puniſhment by Vertue of the Sanction.* If this Scheme look not with a favourable Eye to the *Arminian* Doctrine any may judge.

IN his Fifth Letter to Mr. *Rowan*, he ſays, *That Mr.* Gilleſpie *and Mr.* Dickſon *were the firſt that taught this Doctrine*, viz. *That that Diſpenſation was a proper Covenant of Works, and that none of the Ancients nor of the firſt Reformers has ſo much as the Name* Covenant, *except the* Weſtminſter Confeſſion, *and that there it is only called a Covenant, not yet a proper Covenant.*

BUT, 1*ſt.* It will not follow, That becauſe theſe two Divines explained that Doctrine more accurately, and by ſuch Terms, that therefore that Doctrine is new, more than when *Auguſtin* firſt uſed the Term *Original Sin*, that he was the firſt Inventer of that Doctrine; and we know whoſe Objection it is on this Head, that *Auguſtin* was the firſt Brocher of the Doctrine of Original Sin: Beſides, it is not much for Mr. *Simſon*'s Praiſe, that he Contradicts two ſuch Eminent Divines in a Point of ſuch Moment; whereby it follows, That either he or they are in a dangerous Error. 2*dly.* If the thing meaned by a proper Covenant of Works, be found in other Confeſſions and firſt Reformers, it is no matter if the Name be not found in them, but it is plain they teach, That in *Adam*'s ſinning, all his Poſterity ſinned in him as a

publick Perſon, and that by his Diſobedience they are guilty, as if they had acted that Sin; And that by reaſon of their ſinning in him, they are lyable to Puniſhment, and that as a part of that Puniſhment they are deprived of Original Righteouſneſs, *&c.* Let any conſult *Paræus*, *Bucan* and *Martyr* and others, and ſee if they do not Teach the very ſame Doctrine. 3*dly*. Is it probable, That the *Weſtminſter* Divines did firſt learn this Notion from Mr. *Gilleſpie* and Mr. *Dickſon*; As alſo, a great many ſorreign Divines, who call it a Covenant, or Paction betwixt GOD and Man; I ſhall Name one eminent Divine, who was before either Mr. *Dickſon* or Mr. *Gilleſpie*, *viz*. *Gomarus* in his *Prolegomena*, in his *Oration de Fœdere DEI*, in the very ſecond *Pag*: of the Book, where in general, he ſays, *Fœdus igitur DEI proprie dictum, eſt mutua DEI et hominum obligatio, de Vita Æterna ipſis certa conditione danda, ejus partes ſunt duæ, obligatio DEI quæ eſt vitæ æternæ, et obligatio hominum quæ eſt ſtipulatio conditionis a DEO præſcriptæ. Hoc porro Fœdus eſt duplex, Naturale, et Supernaturale.* And the firſt Covenant, or *Fœdus Naturale*, he deſcribes in the following Paragraph, and gives it all the Ingredients of a proper Covenant; So that we ſee ſome Divines call it a Covenant before *Gilleſpie* and *Dickſon*; And one would think, That *Gomarus* was not the firſt who uſed this Term. 4*thly*. This bold aſſertion is contradicted by the Biſhop of *Sarum*, who as Mr. *Webſter* pertinently cites him, in his Expoſition on the 39 Articles, *Pag*. 113. ſays, That the Diſciples of *Auguſtin* did Believe that a Covenant was made with all Mankind in *Adam*, as their firſt Parent, that he was a Perſon conſti-

tuted

tuted by GOD to repreſent them all, and that the Covenant was made with him, ſo as if he had obeyed, all his Poſterity ſhould have been happy through his Obedience; but by his Diſobedience they were all to be eſteemed to have ſinned in him, his Act being imputed and transferred to them all, *&c.* Where we may Notice, That the Diſciples of *Auguſtin* did not found the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin as Mr. *Simſon* doth in the Sanction, but in his ſinning as their federal Head. *5thly.* That this Doctrine is the ſame with the Doctrine of other *Calviniſt* Churches is plain; Becauſe never any of them cenſured that Doctrine contained in the *Confeſſion*, and that the *Weſtminſter* Divines had a Correſpondence with other Churches, we need not much doubt of it. *6thly.* The *Weſtminſter Confeſſion* doth not call the Covenant of Grace a proper Covenant, and yet it deſcribes both that and the Covenant of Works, ſo as any will ſee they are proper Covenants; Beſides, neither is the Covenant at Mount *Sinai* called a proper Covenant, and yet none do doubt but it was ſuch. *7thly.* Later Divines makes plain the old Doctrine more clearly, but do not contradict it as Mr. *Simſon* does.

LASTLY, His comparing the Aſſembly at *Weſtminſter*, to the Council of *Trent*, and his Remark on the anſwer of the Leſſer *Catechiſm*, *viz. Did GOD leave all Mankind, &c.* As alſo, his ſigning the *Confeſſion of Faith*, with an Explication, as he himſelf tells in his Third Letter to Mr. *Rowan*, *Pag.* 6. and his Fifth Letter to Mr. *Rowan Pag.* 16. give a Swatch of the high eſteem he hath of that Aſſembly, and of his Judgment as to the *Con-*

feſſion

ſeſſion it ſelf, eſpecially when he really and upon the Matter makes the *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſms* contradict one another, as we remarked before.

CHAP. VII.

Concerning Adam's *power to Believe on a Mediator in the ſtate of Innocency; As alſo, concerning the Connection betwixt moral Serioufneſs and Saving Grace.*

HEre we ſhall take notice firſt of ſome Propoſitions he ſays Mr. *Webſter* falſly charges him with.

THE firſt Propoſition is, *That we never had a power in* Adam *of obeying (he ſuppoſes Mr.* Webſter *means of obeying GOD) and therefore never loſt it in* Adam.

NOw if he deny the Propoſition to be his, then he muſt needs own, that we had a power in *Adam* to obey GOD; And if ſo, this muſt be underſtood of a power in him, either conſidered only as our natural Head, or as our federal Head. The laſt he rejects, and the firſt intirely deſtroys the Imputation of his Sin to his Poſterity, as was ſhewed in the former Chapter. To ſay he was our moral Head, I take to be a meer Shift, for it muſt be reduced either to a Natural or Federal Head; beſides that *Turrettin* uſes a moral and federal Head, as *Synonimous* Terms: To ſay he was a moral Head, in as much as the Law was given to him as a Natural Parent, with a Promiſe that Life ſhould deſcend to his Poſterity if he obeyed, and a threatning of Death to extend to his Poſterity

rity if he diſobeyed, is but another Evaſion: For ſuch a Law plainly implies a Paction with him as repreſenting his Poſterity: Or if it do not, then there is no more an Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin to his Poſterity, than there is of the Rebellion of a Nobleman to his Children, when a King threatens him, that if he Rebel, his Poſterity ſhall never Inherit his Fortune: In which caſe, tho' ſuch a Lord's Children ſuffer, by reaſon of their Father's Rebellion, yet neither in the Court of GOD nor Man are they guilty of their Father's Rebellion, nor can it be juſtly charged upon them as their Sin, as *Adam*'s Sin is chargeable upon his Poſterity.

A Second Propoſition he denies as his, is, *That* Adam's *Fault was not our Fault.* To this he ſays, *That if the Meaning be, that it is not our Fault, either by actual Commiſſion or Imputation, that the Propoſition is not his, and that he only denies* Adam's *Fault to be our Perſonal Fault:* And ſays further, *That the Reaſon why he is not ſatisfied with* Marckius *anſwer, when he calls* Adam's *Sin the* propria culpa *of his Poſterity, is, becauſe* propria culpa *denotes our perſonal Fault; and cites for that end Doctor* Owen *in his Book* de juſtificatione *Pag*: 284. And further adds, *That when* Adam's *Sin is called, peccatum commune et cujuſque proprium,* that this is underſtood of inherent Corruption. But, 1*ſt*. Mr. *Simſon* ſtrains *propria culpa* too much, by taking it for what is one's perſonal Fault; For the Sin of another may very well be called our *propria culpa* legally, tho' not perſonally; and he could not but know this to be *Marckius*'s Meaning. 2*dly*. As to the Teſtimonies cited out of *Owen*, 1*ſt*. It's plain that he ſpeaks there

of

of the Sin of another, becoming our personal Sin inherently and subjectively, which indeed is impossible. *2dly.* he speaks of the handing down the Guilt of *Adam*'s Sin, not of the Ground of a legal Imputation thereof, which is *Adam*'s representing us; otherwise, he will make *Owen* found the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin upon the Corruption of our Nature. We shall set down the Words out of *Owen* as follows, *Wherefore Sin under this Consideration as a Transgression of the Preceptive part of the Law, cannot be Communicate from one to another, unless it be by the Propagation of a vitiated Principle or habit; But yet neither so will the personal Sin of one as inherent in him, ever come to be the personal Sin of another.* Adam *hath upon his personal Sin Communicated a vitious and corrupted nature unto his Posterity, and besides the Guilt of his actual Sin is imputed unto them, &c.* But yet his particular personal Sin could never become the personal Sin of his Posterity, any other way than by the Imputation of his Guilt unto them. *3dly.* Not only is Original Sin called *peccatum commune et cujusque proprium*, but *Adam*'s first actual Sin is so called. I shall cite only one Testimony out of *Owen, de Justificatione, Pag:* 20: Where he says, *That by the Imputation of the actual Apostasy of* Adam *the Head of our Nature, his Sin became the Sin of the World.* And doth not the Scripture tell us, *That we sinned in* Adam, *and were made Sinners by his disobedience. Lastly,* I never thought, That when *Adam*'s Sin is called a common Sin, it was mean'd of Original Sin, but thought it was always understood of his first Sin.

A Third Proposition *Pag:* 192. of his Defences he

he denies, is, *That when* Adam *loſt his power to obey, we loſt nothing, yea, had nothing in* Adam *to loſe.* To this he ſays, *That what power of obeying* Adam *loſt, we loſt in him:* But we loſt that power of obeying in *Adam*, either as our natural or federal Head; The firſt deſtroys the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, and the ſecond he will not allow, and the extending of the threatning to his Poſterity, doth not make him one Head or other, but ſuppoſes the capacity under which he was threatned, and ſo can found no Imputation of his Sin.

He delivers his Judgment upon this Head, *Pag.* 195 of his *Defences* in the following Words, Adam *in that ſtate*, viz. (*of Innocency*) *had a power of knowing, believing and doing whatever was neceſſary unto, or conſiſtent with that ſtate, that* GOD *ſhould reveal unto, or require of him, which he and his Poſterity loſt by the Fall; But believing in Chriſt being inconſiſtent with the ſtate of Innocence,* GOD *could not reveal it to him, nor require it of him, and therefore had no Power of believing in him.* We ſhall afterwards conſider this, when Profeſſor *Simſon* comes to prove that *Adam* had no ſuch power, we ſhall Notice ſome things Mr. *Simſon* has, before he come to his direct Proofs.

First, He calls theſe Words (*a Power to Believe*) ambiguous in our Language. And ſays, They may be underſtood two ways. *1ſt.* Of a natural Ability and actual Diſpoſition of Soul, ſufficient for the Exerciſe of ſaving Faith. Or, *2dly.* For a power of Exerciſing that Ability by actual Faith in Chriſt. In the firſt Senſe he ſays, *Pag.* 196. *That he did not deny that* Adam *had a power* i. e. *a natural Ability and Diſpoſition to Believe in Chriſt,*

while

while Innocent. In the ſecond Senſe, he denies *Adam* had any power to Believe.

BUT, *1ſt.* How theſe words (*a power to Believe*) ſhould be ambiguous in our Language, is what I cannot underſtand. *2dly.* The firſt Senſe in which he takes theſe Words, *viz.* for a natural Ability and actual Diſpoſition of Soul ſufficient for the Exerciſe of ſaving Faith without ſupernatural Aſſiſtance, ſeems to point out only that *Adam* had a natural Faculty, that is the formal Principle of Faith; or if he mean beſides, an habit it ſeems ſtrange, that he ſhould have ſuch a Power, and yet never be capable to put it forth in an act; or if he mean only a power to exerciſe Faith, but not Faith in Chriſt, his Diſtinction is not pertinent, for he could not but know that by a power to Believe, Mr. *Webſter* underſtood a power of Believing in Chriſt.

PAGE 197. When Mr. *Webſter* alledges, That this Doctrine of Mr. *Simſon*'s is contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap:* 4. §. 2. As alſo, *Chap:* 9. §. 2. 3. He anſwers, *That neither Places prove this, unleſs Mr.* Webſter *prove, That believing in Chriſt was* Revelatum, *or* Revelandum *to innocent* Adam, *and alſo that a ſufficiency of natural Qualifications for believing in Chriſt was by the Authors of our* Confeſſion *included in the Power* Adam *had to will and to do that which was good and well-pleaſing to GOD; and, conſequently that this Power was included in the Ability of Will to any ſpiritual Good.* But, *1ſt.* Certainly *Adam* had a Power to do ſeveral Things in the State of Innocency, that were neither *Revelata* nor *Revelanda*, as to pity an afflicted Man, to give Charity to the

the Poor; and yet if *Adam* had ſtood there would have been no ſuch Perſons: Did not our LORD pity and ſhew Compaſſion to ſuch, and yet he was without Sin: And have not Believers a Power to do ſeveral Things to which they are neither called at preſent, nor will ever be called, as to give Charity to a Man two Thouſand Miles diſtant. 2*dly*. That a Sufficiency of Power to Believers in Chriſt, is included in that Ability of Will *Adam* loſt, ſeems plain; becauſe when the *Confeſſion of Faith* ſays, That Man loſt all Ability of Will to any ſpiritual Good; he certainly loſt an Ability of Will to any ſpiritual Good to which we now ſtand obliged (unleſs we would put a Force upon the Words of the *Confeſſion*) but believing in Chriſt is a ſpiritual Good to which we are now called: And the Words in the *Confeſſion* are general and extenſive to any ſpiritual Good. As is plain from the latter End of that ſame 3. *Par*: of the 9. *Chap*: Where among the Things that Man has loſt an Ability for, is mention'd, not only *Converſion, but preparing himſelf for it*, which is as inconſiſtent with a State of Innocency as Faith in Chriſt.

ANOTHER Reaſon of Mr. *Webſter*'s is, That if he had not this Power to believe in Chriſt, he could never be ſaid to have loſt it: To which Mr. *Simſon* anſwers, *That this does not prove that believing in Chriſt, was* Revelatum *or* Revelandum *to innocent* Adam. Upon the Proof of which the whole Streſs of the Argument lies. But, 1*ſt*. He doth not tell directly, whether

ther he thinks *Adam* loſt a Power to believe in Chriſt or not; and ſo waves a direct Anſwer to the Argument. 2*dly*. *Adam*'s Power to believe in Chriſt had no Dependence on either it's being *Revelatum* or *Revelandum*: For we ſhewed that *Adam* had a Power to ſeveral Things that were neither *Revelata*, nor *Revelanda* in that State.

PAGE 198. Another Argument of Mr. *Webſter*'s is, If *Adam* never had a Power to believe on Chriſt, nor loſt it; how can any Man be puniſhed for not believing, tho' he cannot believe? For it's an unconteſted Axiom, *That we cannot be obliged to what was never in our Power in any State.* This Reaſon Mr. *Simſon* ſlights and ſays, *He muſt ſeek for another Anſwer than* Adam's *having that Power and loſing it*. But it ſeems a very plain Principle, That we can be obliged to nothing to which we either had not once a Power, nor yet have: And Mr *Simſon* would have done well to tell whether he owns or denies this plain Propoſition. 2*dly*. I ſuppoſe Mr. *Simſon* goes upon this Bottom, *viz*. GOD's Readineſs to give Grace upon Mens ſeeking it, which ſeeking is in their Power: But even this ſuppoſes Man to want a Power to believe; and Believing being a plain moral Duty, it muſt certainly be a Sin, that he wants that Power; but the Want of this Power to believe, can never be their Sin, unleſs they had it in *Adam*: For the Want of a Power, which we neither had nor loſt, cannot be our Sin; even yielding that GOD would grant them that Power, upon their ſeeking it with moral

moral Seriouſneſs, at leaſt the Want of a Power to believe in Chriſt is not their Sin immediately and *prima Inſtantia*, but only their not ſeeking that Power, or Grace to believe, from GOD; conſequently, the Want of that Power to believe is not culpable in them, till once they neglect to ſeek it by prayer, which is ſtrange Doctrine indeed.

In the next Place he anſwers an Argument drawn from the Authority of Orthodox Divines, as Mr. *Rutherford* in his *Exam: Arminianiſ:* and *Turrettin*, he calls their Arguments weak, and ſpeaks contemptibly enough of their Reaſons. I confeſs they are not infallible: But I remark, *1ſt.* That he treats all Orthodox Divines when they differ from him, too much like a ſupercilious Dictator. *2dly.* That it is a Prejudice to his Cauſe, that for ought I know he differs from all Orthodox Divines, who have handled this Queſtion. *3dly.* If it were in one Point only, that he differed from Orthodox Divines, the Caſe were more tolerable; but we ſee he differs in a great many weighty and ſubſtantial Points, ſo that his Doctrine ſeems to be a new Scheme of the Goſpel.

Page 200. Another Topick drawn from this, is, That it's an *Arminian* Error; for *Arminius* ſays, *in his Reſp: ad Artic:* 19. Pag: 128. *Dico et affirmo, aſſevero, profiteor et doceo* Adamum *ante lapſum potentiam credendi in Chriſtum non habuiſſe quia fidei in Chriſtum non erat opus.* To this Mr. *Simſon* anſwers, not by telling us whether he owns that Propoſition of *Arminius* or not, only he calls the Arguments whereby

Arminians

Arminius proves it, weak and inconcludent. 2*dly*. He says, *If it be an Error of* Arminians, *that he is not guilty of it, because he does not teach it*. 3*ly*. He says, *He will not grant a Proposition to be erroneous, because* Arminians *teach it*: But, *first*, The Question is not, Whether the Arguments brought by *Arminius*, and others of his Way be concludent or not, but if they do not maintain the Proposition, to wit, *That* Adam *in a State of Innocency, had not a Power to believe in Christ*? 2*dly*. Whether he teach that Proposition or not, I know not; but sure I am, he has asserted it, in full and plain Terms, in the 195, *Pag*: *of his Defences*, as we noticed before. 3*dly*. I suppose his own strong Arguments, and the Absurdities, wherewith he loads the contrary Doctrine, may be found, as to the Substance of them, in *Limburg* the *Arminian*. 4*thly*. It is true, That a Proposition is not therefore erroneous, because maintained by *Arminians*; but yet, it is certain, that this Proposition has been ever looked upon, as *Arminian*, and that hardly any, but *Arminians* and *Socinians* maintain it.

ANOTHER Topick is, Because *Arminians maintain this Proposition to support their Doctrine of Universal Grace*; To this Mr *Simson* Answers, *That he wished that Mr.* Webster *had cited some Passage out of* Arminius, where he says, *That all Mankind after the Fall have a Power of Believing*; and where he supports this, by saying; *Adam had not a Power of believing in the State of Innocency*: But, 1*st*. I am sure it has been commonly owned among us, that this is one Foundation on which *Arminians* build their Doctrine of Universal Grace, *to wit*, That *Adam* had not a Power to believe in the

the ſtate of Innocency. 2*dly*. *Turrettin* may be believed as well as Mr. *Simſon* who, upon that Queſtion, *An Adamus vires habuerit Credendi in Chriſtum*, in the very beginning thereof tells us, that *Arminians*, that they might defend their Hypotheſis, concerning the Neceſſity of Univerſal ſufficient Grace, did invent this Opinion, that *Adam* never had Power of believing in Chriſt, and therefore could not loſe it by ſin, ſo that GOD cannot now require from us Faith, under the Goſpel, unleſs either GOD give ſufficient Grace to believe, or be ready to give it, if they will ſeek it; where it is plain from *Turrettin* that they build their Doctrine of Univerſal Grace upon this Propoſition. 2*dly*. It is plain, he and they agree in the Doctrine of Moral Serioufneſs. 3*dly*. Whether *Epiſcopius* and *Corvin*, &c. found Univerſal Grace upon *Adam*'s not having a Power to believe, I do not now examine, not having the Books by me: But, 1*ſt*. It is certain, that Univerſal Grace is looked upon as an *Arminian* Doctrine. 2*dly*. That Mr. *Simſon* doth maintain that Doctrine, *while he makes the Covenant of Grace univerſal*, and while he ſays, *That if the Heathen would improve the Light of Nature, Works of Creation*, &c. *GOD would reveal Chriſt to them, and that it is in their Power ſo to do*. 3*dly*. It is certain, That it is a common Argument made uſe of by them, to prove that all Men muſt either have Grace to believe, or GOD be ready to give it to them upon their ſeeking, becauſe *Adam* in the ſtate of Innocency had no ſuch Power; And to confirm this we need but only cite Mr. *Simſon*'s own Words in the 202 *Page of his Defences*

fences: His Words are, *Whereas it is manifest from the Writings of* Arminius *and* Corvin, *that they conſtantly maintain that* Adam *never had ſuch a Power, and therefore could not loſe it: Whence they conclude, that when GOD commanded Men to believe in Chriſt, it was neceſſary he ſhould either give them a Power to believe in him, or be ready to give it them.* From which words it it is plain, that they found Univerſal Grace upon *Adam's* not having a Power to believe: So that I wonder how he could ſay, he could not find this in the Writings of *Arminius* or *Corvin.*

FURTHER, If *Adam* had not a Power of Believing in Chriſt in a ſtate of Innocency, it muſt be becauſe it was inconſiſtent with his perfect ſtate, in regard that Faith ſuppoſes ſin in the Perſon believing which *Adam* then had not; but this does not ſay, he had not ſuch a Power, it indeed ſuppoſes either ſin to be actually in the Man, or that he is in danger thereof; for might not GOD have revealed to *Adam* that he was to fall, but that free Grace would provide a Saviour, could not *Adam* in that caſe have relied on a Saviour for Pardon of theſe ſins he knew he would be ſuffered to fall into. Now a Believer not only believes for the Pardon of ſins that are paſt, but alſo of theſe that he knows he will certainly commit, while he is on this Earth, becauſe of his ſinful Nature, and Faith in Chriſt for Pardon of ſins paſt, and of ſins to come, do not differ but Circumſtantially.

To this he ſays, *Page* 205. *of his Defences*, That *GOD could not have told* Adam *this, becauſe it was inconſiſtent with his own Holineſs and Wiſ-*

dom

dam, and with Adam's *State; for it is a plain Contradiction to the Sanction of the Law,* (in the Day thou eats thou ſhalt die) *yea, it more effectually takes of the Force of the Threatning than the Serpent's Words,* thou ſhalt not ſurely dy. *It was alſo plainly neceſſary for* Adam *and* Eve's *ſtanding, that they ſhould firmly believe the Threatning, to be certain and peremptory, ſeing they were ſo eaſily drawn to tranſgreſs the Commandment.* And further ſays, *That if we may judge of* Adam's *Power, and Capacity to receive ſuch a Revelation from GOD, as Mr.* Webſter *mentions,* &c. *It will at leaſt appear probable that* Adam, *then had no ſufficiency of Strength, and Ability to receive ſuch a Revelation, and therefore needed from GOD a greater Degree of Power and Capacity before he revealed this unto him.* Again Page 206. He ſays, *That the Suppoſition of ſuch a Revelation is impoſſible.* 2dly. *Granting it were not impoſſible, it might be firſt neceſſary, that GOD ſhould give* Adam *a greater Degree of Power, than was given him at his Creation, to render him capable of ſuch a Revelation.* 3dly. He ſays, *upon this Suppoſition it may be queſtioned, whether the Devil would not have ſpoken Truth to* Eve, ye ſhall not ſurely die; *As alſo whether our firſt Parents had ſinned in eating the forbidden Fruit, or rather, whether they had not been obliged to do it, after ſo clear a Manifeſtation of GOD's Will, for the brightſt Manifeſtation of his Attributes.*

To theſe Things we offer, the following Conſiderations, *1ſt.* It is falſe, That the telling of this to *Adam*, would have been inconſiſtent with GOD's Wiſdom and Holineſs in *Adam's* State of Innocency; for do not Believers know, that while

they are here, they are ſtill ſinning, yet that Knowledge is not inconſiſtent with their ſtriving againſt all ſin; Did not Chriſt tell *Peter*, *That he would deny him thrice*, but that did not exeem *Peter*, from a Care to prevent his ſinning. 2*dly*. It is no Contradiction, to the Sanction, more than when GOD tells *Iſrael* by *Moſes*, that after *Moſes* Death, they would go a whoring after Idols, and that thereupon many Evils would befal them; for *Iſrael* might have ſaid, It's needleſs for us to watch againſt Idolatry, ſince we are certainly to fall into it, tho' the Revelation did inform *Adam*, that a Remedy was to be provided; yet it did not aſſure him in particular, that he ſhould get Grace to believe, after his Fall. 3*dly*. When Believers know, That no ſin they ſhall fall into, ſhall make them miſs Heaven; does this of it's Nature encourage them to ſin, or render the Threatning of dreadful Judgments upon them uſeleſs: This looks like the *Arminian* way of Arguing, againſt the Aſſurance of our Perſeverance. 4*thly*. If the Threatning be explained, we will ſee that ſuch a Revelation, would not have enervate the Force of the Threatning, *viz*. *In the Day thou eats, thou ſhall ſurely die*, *i. e.* thou ſhall certainly die ſpiritually, become Mortal, and ſo die a bodily Death and alſo become lyable to Eternal Wrath. 5. This Revelation, would have given *Adam* and *Eve* no Aſſurance, of their Believing after the Fall, and therefore was not inconſiſtent; for that Threatning might have been peremptory as to them. 6*thly*. *Adam* and *Eve*'s yielding to the Temptation, ſo ſoon, no ways proves, that they wanted a Sufficiency of Strength,

for

for receiving ſuch a Revelation, more than, that they had not ſtrength, to have reſiſted the Temptation, abſtract from the Decree; and ſince *Adam* was perfect, and this would have been only an external objective Revelation; I would know, what it was that made a Communication of new Degrees of Strength neceſſary, that *Adam* ſhould be capable to receive ſuch a Revelation. 7*thly*. It is without Ground aſſerted, That ſuch a Revelation was impoſſible; for might not GOD, have revealed to *Adam*, that upon his fall, he would provide a Saviour, by whom, a certain Number was to be ſaved, as well as he told *Peter*, not only of his Fall, but of his Recovery. 8*thly*. The Devil would not have ſpoken Truth to *Adam*. 1*ſt*. Becauſe, as we hinted, the Truth of the Threatning conſiſts, even when a Saviour is provided. 2*dly*. Becauſe, that Revelation would have contained no Aſſurance to *Adam*, that he ſhould have Grace after he fell, to Believe. 3*thly*. This Revelation would no more have warranted *Adam* and *Eve*'s ſinning, than Believers, knowing, that they cannot fall away totally and finally, warrants their ſinning; and if the Aſſurance, Believers have of their Recovery, after falls, does not warrant, nor encourage their ſinning, when they have ſo much Corruption within them, far leſs would ſuch a Revelation, have encouraged or warranted *Adam*'s ſinning; for not the Revelation of future Events, but the Command, is the Rule of our Duty.

He ſays, *Page* 206. *That even ſuppoſing ſuch a Revelation* Adam *would not have been obliged to Acquieſce therein; or the Contrivance of ſuch a way of*

Salvation: And ſays, *That if it can be proven, That he was obliged to acquieſce therein, then he'l, grant he had a Power to acquieſce in it*: But it's ſtrange for doth not every Revelation of the Purpoſes of the Holy and Infinitely Wiſe GOD, *eo ipſo* oblige us to acquieſce therein, or are we at Liberty to approve or diſapprove of his Purpoſes when revealed as we pleaſe, have not all Revelations of GOD's Purpoſes to us, the Force of a Law, as to our acquieſcing therein.

HE ſeems, *P.* 207 to quibble about Mr. *Webſter's* ſaying, *That a cordial acquieſcing in the way of Salvation through Chriſt is a moſt eſſential Act of Juſtifying Faith.* And ſays, *That Juſtifying Faith doth not conſiſt in the Aſſent of the Mind, however firm and ſtedfaſt; but includes a Conviction of Sin and Miſery, and of a Man's loſt Eſtate*, &c. *And a receiving and reſting upon Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs for the Pardon of ſin.* And further ſays, *That none of theſe acts, can poſſibly be included in any acquieſcence in the Way of Salvation that innocent* Adam *was capable of, becauſe on Suppoſition it had been revealed to* Adam, *all the Faith he could have had, was to aſſent unto the Truth of it's being a good way of ſaving Sinners, which Angels alſo might have had; but ſuch an Aſſent tho' included in Juſtifying Faith, yet doth not exhauſt the whole Nature of it.*

FURTHER *Pag:* 209. he ſays, *That according to Mr.* Owen *in his Book on Juſtification, Pag:* 111. *That Faith alone is juſtifying, which hath Juſtification actually accompanying it; for thence alone it hath that Denomination: To ſuppoſe a Man to have juſtifying Faith, and not to be juſtify'd, is to ſuppoſe a Contradiction.* From whence Mr. *Simſon* infers, *That*

of innocent Adam *had such a Power of believing, he might have been actually justified and pardoned, for eating the forbidden Fruit, before he committed that Sin, which was a far better Security from it, than a Popish Indulgence.* Moreover he says, *That this Act of Faith, exercised by innocent* Adam, *while yet he represented his Posterity, must needs have been imputed to them all, as well as his Sin, and so they should have obtained the Pardon of it, in, and with him.*

BUT *first*, tho' it be very true, that justifying Faith consists not in a bare Assent of the Mind; yet it is very certain, that this cordial Acquiescence in the Way of Salvation, is included in the Nature of saving Faith; and there may be a bare Assent of the Mind, where this is not. 2*dly*. *Adam* might not only have acquiesced, but also laid Stress on a Saviour, for Deliverance from these Sins he was warned, that he was to fall into. Now is it not the same Faith in a Believer, whereby he rests upon the Righteousness of a Saviour, for pardon of Sin, he knows, he will certainly fall into, while in this World; and whereby he rests upon him, for the Pardon of Sins past? The Application to the case in Hand, is obvious and plain: And is it not the same Faith, that relies on CHRIST to come, and on Christ actually exhibited? 3*dly*. Sense of Sin, and a lost State, *&c.* is necessarly supposed to Faith, as we are now circumstanced; but is not supposed to Faith in every Circumstance: The Possibility of Danger, and the Certainty of sinning make Way for the Exercise of that Faith, as to the Substance of the Act, tho' not as to all the Circumstances thereof. For when a Believer relies upon

Christ

Chriſt, for the Pardon of future Sins, he cannot be under a Conviction of the Guilt of theſe Sins, which he hath not yet committed; Senſe of danger, and that he will be ſtill ſinning while here, makes him capable to exerciſe Faith, for the Pardon of theſe Sins. *4thly.* Angels might have aſſented unto that Way, but could never have laid Streſs on a Saviour for Salvation, as *Adam* might have done; becauſe he could never have been a fit Saviour for them, being not to take on their Nature; and becauſe they were not to be ſuffered to fall. *5thly.* Juſtifying Faith, as required from us, in this lapſed State, is ever followed with Juſtification, that is very true; and with Reference unto this State it is called juſtifying; becauſe now Juſtification is offered, and infallibly follows upon believing: But in the State of Innocency, tho' the Faith would have been the ſame as to the Subſtance; yet it would not, nor could in that State be required, as a Condition of Juſtification; becauſe *Adam* had not yet ſinned, which the Requiſition of Faith, as a Condition of Juſtification, ſtill ſuppoſes: But it would only have been a ſimple moral Duty, and a Branch of that Obedience required of *Adam* by the Law, as is plain: And ſo his *Simile* of a *Popiſh Indulgence* is to little Purpoſe; becauſe tho' *Adam* had acted Faith in that State, it could not have ſecured to him the Exerciſe of it again, when he had fallen, in which State only it could have been a Condition of Juſtification. *6thly.* Conſequently his Sin could not have been pardoned before it was committed; becauſe it was then only a ſimple Duty, not a Condition of Pardon. And *laſtly*, it could not

not be imputed to *Adam*, or his Poſterity; becauſe Pardon of Sin could not be annexed to Faith, exerciſed by him in that State, it would only have gone in as a Piece of moral Obedience, to make up his legal Righteouſneſs: Nor could any Faith, exerciſed in that State, ſecure to him Grace to exerciſe it after he had fallen.

THERE is one Thing further, we take Notice of, which we ſhould have obſerved before, in the 203 *Pag*: *of his Defences*, where he makes himſelf merry with an Argument advanced by Mr. *Webſter*, viz. *That, becauſe according to Mr.* Simſon, *we loſt not the Power of believing in* Adam, *therefore we muſt ſtill have it*; he compares this Argument to the common School *Sophiſm*, *Quod non perdidiſti, habes*: But it ſeems Mr. *Simſon* has not conſidered, That the Streſs of Mr. *Webſter*'s Argument does not ly ſimply in this, *That whatever we loſt not in* Adam *we muſt now have*; but in this, *viz. What we loſt not in* Adam, *and yet are obliged to have, that we muſt ſtill have*: Now Mr. *Simſon* ſays plainly, *That we loſt not the Power to believe, in* Adam: And I ſuppoſe, he will not deny, but we are obliged to have a Power to believe; otherwiſe the Want of a Power to believe, would not be Mens Sin, which I wot not, if Mr. *Simſon* will affirm. Now, if we be obliged to have a Power to believe, we muſt either have that Power ſtill, or if we want it, it muſt be the Effect of Sin, that is ſome way ours: For we cannot be deprived of any Moral Perfection, we are bound by the Law to have; but by a Sin, that is ſome way ours: And conſequently, it being loſt by

a Sin, that is ſome way ours, it ſuppoſeth, that ſome time or other, we had that Power.

HE ſays, *Pag:* 210. *That he muſt own, that he hath not yet found any of our Divines acquit themſelves, in this Diſpute, to the Conviction of their Adverſaries, with ſuch Force and Evidence, as he could wiſh* (this ſeems to be a pretty bold Cenſure upon Orthodox Divines) *and therefore, he thinks it his Duty, to give another Anſwer* (I wiſh he thereby do not give up ſome momentuous Point of Doctrine to our Adverſaries) *To which,* he ſays, *he is moved by another Objection of our Adverſaries,* namely, *Suppoſing* Adam *had a Power of believing in Chriſt, and by his own Fault loſt it, to himſelf, and us, and that for his Sin, both he and we deſerve Eternal Wrath, and that GOD might juſtly leave us under Condemnation, without Hope of Pardon: Granting all theſe things were true;* yet they ſay, *If GOD declare, That he will extend Mercy and Clemency to them, and promiſe Pardon, under a Condition: Juſtice requires, That it be either what they can perform, in their own Strength, or that GOD give, or be ready to give Strength: For,* ſay they, *To offer Mercy, and in the mean Time, to require under a new Penalty, what is impoſſible for them to do, is contrary to the Nature of Clemency, and Rules of Juſtice, even tho' they loſt their Power, by their former Sin; unleſs with the Command GOD give them Strength, or be ready to give it.*

IN general it ſeems, That no Orthodox Divine was ever able to anſwer this Objection, which is their common Objection againſt our Doctrine upon this Head, which looks like enough *his own dictatory Humour.* 2*dly.* I obſerve, That he and they agree pretty well on this Head. 1*ſt.* They deny

deny *Adam* had a Power to believe, in a State of Innocency; ſo does Mr. *Simſon*. 2*dly*. They deny, *Adam* loſt that Power by his Sin; ſo does Mr. *Simſon*. 3*thly*. They ſay, That GOD is ready to give Grace to believe to them, that ſeek it, and that ſuch ſhall infallibly get it; ſo does Mr. *Simſon*, as we ſhall ſee.

THE Strength of the Argument lies in this; *Firſt*, That it is inconſiſtent with Mercy and Juſtice, to make an Offer of Pardon, to impotent Sinners upon a Condition impoſſible to them; unleſs the Condition were in their Power, or Grace to do it, be infallibly linked to ſomething in their Power: Becauſe ſuch an Offer, is of no Advantage to them, being under a Condition, as impoſſible to them, as perfect Obedience. 2*dly*. It is a mocking them: 3*dly*. It were better for them, to ly ſtill under the Curſe of the Law, without ſuch an Offer: Such and the like things are to be found in *Limburg*. For Anſwer to which Objection, we offer theſe Things, 1*ſt*. Though Faith be not in our Power, yet, it is eaſier than perfect Obedience, as to us in this lapſed State; for it's performable in a lapſed State; ſo is not perfect Obedience. 2*dly*. The Offer of Pardon upon believing, ſays plainly, That ſome are brought to believe; and this is Ground of Encouragement to Sinners, to hang on, as not knowing, but they may be among ſuch, who ſhall believe. 3*dly*. The Commands and Offers of the Goſpel, are Life-giving Commands, and convey a Power to believe, to all that are Elect; and none knowing who are Elect, till they believe, all have equal Encouragement, to hang on in the Uſe of Means. 4*thly*. Is it not a Mercy,

That

That their Salvation is not only poſſible, but probable, by enjoying theſe Means, whereby Salvation is applied, and it's in their Power, to ly in the Uſe of theſe Means? *5thly.* The Hearers of the Goſpel do not what is certainly in their Power; and therefore have no Ground to quarrel, tho' Faith, upon which Pardon is offered, be not in their Power. *6thly.* Natural Men may do many things, by the common Aſſiſtance of the Spirit: And tho' there be no infallible Connection, betwixt any thing they can do, and ſaving Faith; yet there is a probable Connection, betwixt the Uſe of Means on their Part, and ſaving Faith; for they enjoying the outward Means, may do ſeveral Things, by Way of external Duty, and the Spirit oft-times prevents them, with common Motions: And this Way, GOD often comes, unto the Soul; and ſuch Exerciſes are oft-times followed with Converſion and Faith: We ſee, That a probable Connection, between the Means and the End, in other Caſes, both obliges and encourages Men, to the Uſe of Means: And ſhould not ſuch a Connection, in this Caſe much more encourage Men? If Men were but ſenſible of what they deſerve, it would fill them with Wonder, That they ſhould be put in a State, wherein Salvation is not only poſſible, but probable. *7thly.* Does not this Argument militate as forcibly againſt the *Antecedent*, and *Infallible Decree*, which he himſelf ſeems to acknowledge: For may not one as ſtrongly argue, What Mercy is there in the offering of Converting Grace to Sinners, upon their ſeeking it, with moral Seriouſneſs, which tho' it be in their Power; yet by an

infallible Decree it is fixed, that the greater Part of them ſhall never ſo ſeek it: For it ſeems to be no great Matter, whether we ſay, That it is in Mens Power, to be morally ſerious, or not in their Power; if it be determined by an antecedent Decree, That the greateſt Part by far, ſhall never uſe that Power right. GOD has tyed Men to the Uſe of Means, in ſeeking Converting Grace; becauſe he deals with them, as rational Creatures; and yet he has not infallibly linked Converſion with any Uſe of Means, they can make, to ſhew, That their Salvation is intirely of Grace.

NOT being ſatisfied *Page* 211. with what Anſwer is given by Orthodox Divines, He ſays, *he is obliged to give another Anſwer, of which,* he ſays, *Mr.* Webſter *gives a very indiſtinct Account in his Lybel, we ſhall ſet down the Words as they are in Mr.* Webſter's *Libel,* viz. *the Juſtice of GOD in commanding us to obey, appears evidently; if we conſider he hath been pleaſed to reveal his Grace, and offers Strength to us by the Goſpel, and commands us to ask and we ſhall receive; and we have natutural Powers and Abilities to ſeek the Lord's ſpecial and ſaving Grace, which if we do, he hath promiſed to give us that Grace,* Matt; 7. 7. *GOD may ſovereignly prevent Sinners, when they are not ſeeking him: But his ordinary Way of communicating his Grace, is in the Way of their ſeeking it.* Now if this be not the very ſame with his own Anſwer, which Immediatly follows: Any may judge.

HE ſays, *That GOD doth juſtly command us in the Goſpel to believe in Chriſt, under a ſpecial Penalty: And for this he gives four Reaſons.*

1. BECAUSE as in the ſame Goſpel, upon the one Hand, he tells us, *We cannot believe of our ſelves, unleſs it be given us of GOD: So on the other Hand he makes an Offer of Grace to enable us to believe; which is of as large an Extent, as the Command to believe; and all who are commanded to believe, are alſo commanded to ſeek of GOD Grace to believe.* And he ſays, *GOD has promiſed to give this Grace to all, who ſeek it ſeriouſly: And for this End, he alledges* Rev: 22. 17. Matt: 7. 7, 8. In which laſt Place he ſays, *The Promiſe of ſaving Grace to them that ſeek it ſeriouſly is plain; becauſe he is there ſpeaking to a mixed Multitude conſiſting of Jews and Gentiles; becauſe the Command to ask is repeated thrice, and the Promiſe annexed ſix Times: So that it muſt be the unqueſtionable Duty of all to ask, ſeek, and knock; and the Promiſe being repeated ſo oft ſays he will not fail to accompliſh it to them that ſeek, unleſs we may ſuppoſe that his Commands are better to be believed than his Promiſes:* And he ſays, *That the Certainty of the Promiſe, is confirmed by propoſing the Example of any Parent, who would not give his Son a Stone when he asked Bread; and from thence concludes, That if they being evil, knew how to give good Things* &c. By which he ſays is meant ſaving Grace, which he confirms from *Luke*, 11, 12. 13.

Now to thir Things we offer theſe Conſiderations. *1ſt.* He plainly affirms, That there is a Promiſe of Converſion, and the firſt Grace made to, and infallibly linked with ſuch a ſeeking, as is in the Power of natural Men; which is falſe and dangerous Doctrine: For when the Promiſe of Converſion, or Grace to Believe is revealed

revealed, or preached to them; and they are commanded to ſeek that Grace in the Uſe of Means: It doth not ſuppoſe, That they can ſeek in a right Manner, or that Converſion is infallibly linked with any ſeeking they are capable to uſe, only it points out their Duty, and that it is in the Uſe of Means, GOD converteth Sinners: and that it is in that Way only, they can expect it: Which both obliges and encourages them to the Uſe of theſe Means, they being the Road wherein Chriſt walketh, and Sinners may expect a Cure: For it's certain there is no infallible Promiſe of ſaving Grace to any Thing a natural Man can do. 2*dly*. Are not all who are commanded to believe, encouraged with a ſure Promiſe of Pardon, and is not the Promiſe of equal Extent with the Command to believe? If therefore, becauſe ſeeking hath the Promiſe of finding, it follows, That it is in Mens Power to ſeek, will it not follow alſo, That it is in their Power to believe? 3*dly*. We would notice, That this is the plain Doctrine of *Arminians*, viz. *That if Men improve common Grace, they ſhall receive ſaving Grace*: As is to be ſeen in *Turrettine Part*: 1. *Loc*: 1. *Queſt*: 4 §. 1. And as he himſelf gives an Account of *Arminius*, and *Corvin*'s Judgment upon this Head *Pag*: 202 *of his Defences*: We ſhall ſet down Mr. *Simſon*'s Words, though we took Notice of them before: *Whence* (*ſays Mr.* Simſon) *they conclude when GOD commanded Men to believe in Chriſt, it was neceſſary, he ſhould either give them a Power to believe in Chriſt, or be ready to give it them*. 4*thly*. All ſound Divines hold, That there are

are abſolute Promiſes, ſuch as the Promiſes of Converſion, and the firſt Act of Faith, which are not infallibly linked with any Thing natural Men can do; but if the Promiſes of Converſion, and the firſt Grace be infallibly ſuſpended upon, and linked with ſuch a ſeeking, as natural Men are capable of in that State; then theſe Promiſes are as conditional, as the Promiſe of Pardon and Juſtification; which I would think is ſtrange Doctrine in this Church. For, *5thly*. If ſuch a ſeeking be the Condition upon which the Promiſe of Converſion and ſaving Grace infallibly follows; then Faith is not the only Condition of intereſting us in the Promiſes, which is plainly contrary to Scripture, which tells us, That we receive the Promiſe by Faith, and are Heirs of the Promiſe by Faith: Yea, further, then there is a prior Condition to Faith, which is a Condition of obtaining Faith it ſelf, and ſo of an Intereſt in all the other Promiſes: But I ever thought, That Faith had been the only Condition of an Intereſt in the Promiſes. *6thly*. Then ſeeking with moral Seriouſneſs is a Condition, of as great Moment and Importance, as Faith it ſelf; for Faith, and ſo all the Benefites of the Covenant infallibly follow upon this ſeeking, and ſo a Condition of Salvation of as great Neceſſity and Moment as Faith it ſelf, is in the Power of natural Men. *7thly*. This ſeeking is a Condition of obtaining ſaving Grace either conſidered abſolutely in it ſelf; if ſo then it is a Condition more properly than Faith is; for Faith is not a Condition, but relatively, as it reſpects an imputed Righteouſneſs: And

ſo

ſo it is a Condition in the ſame Propriety, that Works were under the firſt Covenant; or it is a Condition relatively conſidered: But this cannot be; becauſe it doth not reſpect an imputed Righteouſneſs, as it's Object, which is peculiar to ſaving Faith. 8*thly*, Further, then this ſeeking of natural Men is a Condition of the Covenant as well as Faith; yea, and prior to it: For, Converſion is nothing elſe, but GOD's writing the Copy of his Covenant upon our Hearts: And of this Mr. *Simſon* makes ſeeking with moral Serioufneſs, an infallible Condition. 9*thly*. Natural Men either need common Aſſiſtance of the Spirit to help them to ſeek with moral Seriouſneſs, as well as they need ſaving Grace to believe. To affirm this, is palpably falſe; and to deny the preparatory Work of the Spirit; Or if all natural Men need this common Aſſiſtance, then it muſt be promiſed; and if ſo, I would know what is the Condition to be performed by natural Men, to which the Promiſe of common Aſſiſtance to be morally ſerious, is infallibly linked. 10*thly*. As to the Scriptures, *Rev.* 22. 17. *Iſa.* 55. 1. He adduces: 1*ſt*. It ſeems according to Mr. *Simſon*, That by every one that is athirſt, is underſtood ſuch as are morally ſerious, which I conceive is a new Gloſs: I ſuppſe if Mr. *Simſon* were writing upon the Scriptures, he would give us new Gloſſes that we never heard of. 2*dly*. I would think, That by the Thirſty are underſtood ſenſible Sinners who are emptied of themſelves, and their own Righteouſneſs, That have ſuch Deſires after Chriſt and his Benefites, as nothing leſs can ſatisfie them;

which

which I think is ſomething above moral Seriouſneſs. *3dly.* I would think that Thirſt here denotes the fainter and weaker Actings of Grace and Faith: As 1 *Pet*: 2. 1, 2. which I would think is more agreeable to the Analogy of Faith, and ſuch are particularly invited to come; becauſe they are ready to doubt of their being made welcome. *4thly.* Then it ſeems, it is in the Power of natural Men to thirſt, to be Monileſs, and to be willing in the Senſe of the former Scriptures; whereas I ever thought, That this Thirſt, and this Willingneſs, was the Effect of the Spirit's ſpecial Operation, *Pſ*: 10. 17. *Lord thou haſt heard the Deſire of the Humble, thou wilt prepare their Heart, thou wilt cauſe thine Ear to hear:* Where we ſee, That theſe Deſires are the Effect of GOD's preparing the Heart. *5thly.* It ſeems, That the Thirſt to which the Promiſe is made, *Iſa:* 44. 3. is only moral Seriouſneſs; whereas we find the Thirſty in the later Clauſe of the *Verſe*, to be meant of Chriſt's Seed and Of-ſpring: So *Matt*: 5: 6. It ſeems That the hungering and thirſting after Righteouſneſs in that *Verſe*, are the morally ſerious to whom the Promiſe of a gracious Fill is made I think this is a new Way of expounding Scripture.

As to *Mat*. 7. *Verſ*: 7, 8, 9. on which he lays ſo great ſtreſs, we anſwer, *Firſt*, To underſtand *ſeeking* in that Text, of ſeeking with Moral Seriouſneſs, is a Gloſs new and ſtrange; I ſuppoſe none but *Arminians* ſo expound this Text. *2dly.* I would think, that it is to be taken here in the ſame Senſe, in which it is taken in other

Place

places of Scripture, as compriſing the Subſtance of practical Godlineſs, and ſo for a Fruit of a ſaving State; for the beſt Way to expound Scripture, is to compare one Scripture with another; (tho' we grant, that Prayer here is ſpecially intended) in which Senſe we find it given as the Mark of GOD's People, *Pſal*: 24. 6. 27. 8. 119. 2. and Promiſes made, and fulfilled to ſuch ſeekers, *Pſal*: 9. 10. 22. 26. 63. 1. 69. 32. *Prov*: 8. 17. I ſee no Reaſon why it ſhould be taken for Moral Seriouſneſs, *Mat*: 7. 7. more than in the forecited Scriptures. 3*dly*. Do not other Scriptures tell us, That it is only ſuch ſeekers who can expect to find, who ſeek by Faith in a Redeemer; and all the Hearers of the Goſpel, whether Regenerate or Unregenerate, are commanded thus to ſeek, *Jam*: 1. 6. *Let him ask in Faith*. To underſtand this only of a general Faith, I ſuppoſe pretty groſs; for certainly *James* directed them, as Chriſt directed his Diſciples, to ſeek or pray in his Name: And as *Paul* directs *Heb*: 13. 15. and 1 *Peter* 2. 5. it is the ſame Faith *Paul* ſpeaks of, *Heb*: 11. 5, 6. *without which* he tells us, *it is impoſſible to pleaſe GOD*: And any that reads the Context, and the former Chapter, may eaſily ſee, that *Paul* ſpeaks of Saving Faith; to underſtand this of a general Faith, in GOD's Goodneſs and the Promiſe, is palpably groſs; becauſe, ſo a general Faith would intereſt a Man in one of the greateſt Promiſes of the Covenant before he have Saving Faith, viz. The Promiſe of Converſion; beſides, That Faith can never be exerciſed upon the Promiſe, without an Eye to a Mediator, as is plain, he

being the very Subſtance and Foundation of all the Promiſes. *3dly.* How oft ſoever they be commanded to ſeek, and however often the Promiſe of finding be annexed, it follows not, That it is in their Power to ſeek as the Command requires: it ſhews indeed the Connection betwixt the End and the Mean, and the Way in which Men are to find him, but no Way ſays it is in their Power ſo to ſeek him, more than when Men are frequently commanded to believe, and the Promiſe of Eternal Life as often annexed. *5thly.* Is not Prayer in the *Catechiſms* deſcribed to be *an offering up of our Deſires in the Name of Chriſt, &c.* And that as it is a Duty common to all Chriſtians, we read not a Word there of a praying with Moral Seriouſneſs. *6thly.* The Commands are doubtleſs as much to be believed as the Promiſes; but it follows not, That becauſe the Promiſes are ſure upon the Implement of the Command, that therefore it is in the Power of Natural Men to fulfil the Command. *7thly.* We do not find our Lord offering Converſion to *Nicodemus* upon a certain Condition, but ſimply preſſing the Neceſſity of it upon him: We would diſtinguiſh betwixt an Offer and a Promiſe; every Thing that is offered, is alſo promiſed, but every Thing that is promiſed, is not offered: For Inſtance, the New Heart, and the firſt Act of believing on Chriſt are promiſed to the Elect; but they cannot be ſaid to be offered to the Hearers of the Word, becauſe what is offered muſt be received by the Hand of Faith, which is the only Inſtrument of receiving what the Goſpel offers: Now Men cannot receive the foreſaid Bleſſings, till once they be poſ-

ſeſſed

ſeſſed of them; beſides, that the firſt Thing offered to Sinners in the Goſpel, is a Mediator to be received by Faith. Now if there be an Offer of Grace to believe upon Condition of Moral Seriouſneſs, then Faith is firſt offered to Sinners upon Condition of Moral Seriouſneſs, before Chriſt be offered to them upon believing, which I would think is a new Scheme of the Goſpel.

I ſhall for further clearing of this, ſo far as I take it up, Propoſe the ſtrength of what *Arminians*, or others can draw from this Text. *Firſt*, It may be ſaid, Certainly Natural Men are to ſeek every Thing they want, but they want converting Grace, and Faith. 2*dly*. That the Promiſes of finding, here, annexed to the Command, muſt conſequently include the finding of what they are to ſeek, and ſo converting Grace, unleſs we ſay, That the Promiſe is not as extenſive as the Command; and that there are Commands in the Goſpel that have not Promiſes annexed to them: Whereas it is our common Doctrine that every Command of the Goſpel has a Promiſe. 3*dly*. That the Promiſe is here infallibly linked with, and follows upon their ſeeking. 4*thly*. That wherever there is a Conditional Promiſe made under the Goſpel, it is plainly ſuppoſed, that the Condition is performable by Men, either by their own natural Strength, or by Saving Grace, unleſs we make ſome of the Promiſes of the Goſpel, like the Promiſe of Life in the Covenant of Works under Condition of Perfect Obedience, which never any performed in this Life: So that the Command of ſeeking, reſpecting Natural Men, and the Promiſe of converting Grace, being made

upon their Seeking, ſuppoſes That Natural Men are capable to ſeek before the Promiſe of Saving Grace be implemented in them, which ſeeking can be no other than Moral Seriouſneſs; for they are not capable of any other in that State.

IN anſwer to this, we offer theſe Conſiderations. 1*ſt*. As to the firſt Propoſition; It is true, Natural Men are bound to ſeek converting Grace, but then, I want to know how they are to ſeek it. For either they are bound to ſeek it only with Moral Seriouſneſs; and if ſo, this plainly deſtroys the ſpiritual meaning of the Law, and their praying for it with Moral Seriouſneſs is without Sin, becauſe the Command, according to this Suppoſition obliges them to ſeek only with Moral Seriouſneſs: Or, they are obliged to pray for converting Grace, with theſe Qualifications, that the Spirituality of the Law requires. And if ſo, his Argument is gone; For there is here no Promiſe made to praying with Moral Seriouſneſs. 2*dly*. And conſequently the Promiſe here of finding, (ſeeking and praying with Moral Seriouſneſs, not being the only, farleſs the chief Qualification required, in ſeeking, or Prayer) cannot include the Promiſe of finding converting Grace: Becauſe ſeeking here required, is ſuch a ſeeking, as ſuppoſes the Perſons ſo ſeeking to be converted already; and ſo the Promiſe to be fulfilled in them. 3*dly*. True it is, That every Command in the Goſpel, hath a correſpondent Promiſe, either abſolute, or conditional; and ſo there is an abſolute Promiſe of converting Grace reſpecting the Elect; but to ſay, That every Command of the Goſpel, hath a conditional

Pro

Promiſe annexed to it, which infallibly follows upon the Performance of the Command, is to deſtroy the abſolute Promiſes: And to ſay, That there are ſome Goſpel Commands, for the Performance of which, we need not the Promiſe of the Spirit: Yea, ſuch a material Command as the Application of the Covenant of Grace depends upon. 4*thly*, From what we ſaid, it is plain, That the ſeeking here required, is more than Moral ſeeking; conſequently, that the Promiſe of finding here, infallibly linked to this ſeeking, cannot include the Promiſe of converting Grace: Becauſe the ſeeking here required, ſuppoſes the Perſons here ſeeking to be Converted. 5*thly*, Upon this the fourth Propoſition falls to the Ground. The Condition here required, is performable by Grace, and ſo the Promiſe is infallibly linked with it: But the ſeeking here, being more than a ſeeking with Moral Seriouſneſs, the Promiſe here, cannot include converting Grace; becauſe the ſeeking here required in the Text, ſuppoſes the Perſons to be converted, as we hinted before: So that there is ſtill an infallible Connection betwixt ſeeking, and finding in the Senſe of the Text.

IN general we conceive, That our LORD is here ſpeaking to his Diſciples who were Believers, either Really or in Profeſſion; And we find the Scripture ſpeaking to the laſt, as if they were really Believers: Partly, becauſe they give out themſelves for ſuch, and partly from Judgment of Charity, and this ſeems clear from *Math.* 5: 1, 2. Where, tho' there was a great Multitude, it is ſaid, *His Diſciples came to Him, and He taught them*

hem, which relates Principally to His Diſciples, as is plain from *Luk.* 11.1. Where His Diſciples came to Him deſiring Him, *That He would teach them to Pray.* 2*dly.* He not only ſtiles GOD their Heavenly Father, but in anſwer to their Deſire, directs them to ſay, *Our Father which art in Heaven, &c.* which certainly is to be underſtood of His being a Father by ſpecial Covenant Relation; as is plain from all Expoſitors, that have commented upon the LORD's Prayer, and from the Larger *Catechiſm's*, explaining that *Preface*; Where it is ſaid, *We are to draw near with Confidence of His Fatherly Goodneſs, and our Intereſt therein, and Reverence, and other Child-like Diſpoſitions and Heavenly Affections*, &c. Now is any Natural Man Warranted to ſay, *Our Father*, in that Senſe; or can they Pray with ſuch Diſpoſitions as are required in that Queſtion. True it is, GOD is the Father even of Natural Men, as a Creator, and as he offers them his Grace, *&c.* But it is dull and flat to ſay, That this is meant in the LORD's Prayer, tho' it may be ſuppoſed; Yea, none can call GOD Father, even in that Senſe, as is required in the LORD's Prayer, but by the ſpecial Aſſiſtance of the Spirit, as the Apoſtle tells us, that none can call Jeſus Lord, but by the Holy Ghoſt. 1 *Cor.* 12. 3. 3*ly.* The Expoſitors in *Pool's* Annotations, and Mr. *Henry* on *Mat*: 7. ſeem plainly to expound this ſeeking, of ſuch a ſeeking, as is peculiar to Believers. The Annotators ſay on *Mat*: 7. 7. That we are to ask with Faith, Diligence, Perſeverance, and with Importunity, which I much doubt if Natural Men be capable of.

IF it be ſaid, That certainly Natural Men are bound

bound by Vertue of this Command, to ſeek what they want, and ſo converting Grace; And the Promiſe being as extenſive as the Command, muſt include a Promiſe of Converting Grace; and Natural Men are only capable of Praying with moral Seriouſneſs. We anſwer, That the Command abſtractly conſidered, binds them to ſeek every thing with Faith in Chriſt, without conſidering, whether they have Ability to do it or not, even as it Commands them to believe in Chriſt. 2*dly*. The Command here conſidered, as it hath a Promiſe infallibly linked to it, cannot reſpect Natural Men; Becauſe the Seeking here required in the Text, ſuppoſes the Perſons to be converted, as we hinted before. Nor does the Command reach further than the Promiſe, becauſe there are abſolute Promiſes of Grace, with reference to the Elect, to help them ſo to pray. But there is no conditional Promiſe of Saving Grace, annexed to to any Prayer of a Natural Man. 1*ſt*. Becauſe there is no Precept that requires only ſuch a Prayer from Natural Men, Becauſe all Prayers muſt be offered up in the Name of Chriſt. 2*ly*. Becauſe the beſt Prayers of Natural Men are ſaid to be Sin. *Prov:* 15. 18. 3*dly*. Becauſe being out of Chriſt, their Prayers cannot be accepted. 4*thly*. Becauſe this were to make a morally Serious Prayer a Condition of intereſting them in one of the greateſt Promiſes of the Goſpel, before they have Faith, or be in Chriſt, and ſo they would be Heirs of one of the greateſt Promiſes before they are in Chriſt. And Faith ſhould not be the only or firſt mean of apprehending or applying the Promiſes, whereas we are ſaid to receive the Promiſes by Faith.

IN-

INDEED the Promiſe of converting Grace is propoſed in general in the Goſpel, not that it is infallibly linked with any thing Natural Men can do; But becauſe that it is in the uſe of Means on their part, that the Promiſe is generally fulfilled, and becauſe it is only in the uſe of theſe Means, they can expect it; And theſe Means being the way in which the Promiſe is fulfilled, this is as much Encouragment, as the State they are in is capable of, *i. e.* Salvation is poſſible, yea probable to ſuch in the uſe of Means; So Directions are given to Natural Men in Order to Converſion, not that they are capable to perform theſe Directions in a Spiritual Manner, but becauſe it's in the uſe of theſe Means, GOD prevents Sinners with converting Grace, and ſuch who neglect them, can never expect converting Grace.

HE calls this *Pa:* 215. *a Plain and Neceſſary Part of the Goſpel, which our LORD preached to a mixed Multitude, and that many Miniſters preach this Doctrine.* But, 1*ſt*. If this (That if Men ſeek Converting Grace with Moral Seriouſneſs, they ſhall infallibly obtain it) be a plain and neceſſary part of the Goſpel, then this is ſuch a part of it, as no Orthodox Divine ever yet maintained, for I know none who maintain it, but *Arminians* and the Adverſaries of Truth. 2*dly*. Then the firſt Application of the Grace of the Covenant, is by and upon Works performed by Men in the Strength of their Natural Abilities, and not by Free Grace, for it's not by Faith, becauſe ſuch are ſuppoſed not to be yet converted: And therefore it being ſuſpended upon their moral Seriouſneſs, it muſt be of Works, which is plainly contrary to *Rom:* 11. *&c.*

3*dly*.

3dly. If any Miniſters have preached ſuch Doctrine, they have taken the wrong Way, by ſending Men firſt to trade with their own Stock, and to build the obtaining the firſt Application of the Grace of the ſecond Covenant, upon the Rubbiſh of the firſt Covenant, *viz.* The Improvement of their Natural Abilities in moral Serioufneſs.

A Second Propoſition he lays down P. 216. is, *That there are Means appointed of GOD for obtaining this Grace, to be uſed by theſe, who yet want it, ſuch as Reading, Hearing, Meditation, Prayer for converting Grace; which Means, when diligently uſed, with Seriouſneſs, Sincerity and Faith of being heard, in Oppoſition to Sloth, Hypocriſie, Deceit and Formality; GOD hath Promiſed to Bleſs with Succeſs, as is Evident from what hath been ſaid above,* to which he adds, *Pſal.* 145. 18.

BUT, *1ſt.* It ſeems Queſtionable, if the foreſaids Qualifications (as Diligence, Sincerity in Oppoſition to Formality, Hypocriſie, *&c.*) be not what exceeds the Nature of moral Seriouſneſs and the Powers of Natural Men; ſure, if Natural Men can do all theſe Things, their Nature is not ſo far debaſed and diſabled by Sin, as the Scriptures hold forth. *2dly.* I would know, what Kind of Faith of being heard it is, wherewith a Natural Man can pray? If it be Faith in CHRIST, that is ſaving Faith, and ſuppoſes Converſion; if it be Faith in GOD's general Mercy without reſpect to a Mediator, then this cannot be. For, *1ſt.* GOD's Mercy is now revealed in the Goſpel, to be only in Chriſt. *2dly.* All the Promiſes are ſaid to be Bottom'd in Chriſt, in Him yea and Amen. 2 *Cor:* 1. 20. *3dly.* There is no right coming to GOD, *i. e.* believing but in Chriſt, *Jo:* 14.

14. 6. *4thly.* GOD out of CHRIST is a consuming Fire, and therefore no Faith is accepted, that traveleth not to GOD through CHRIST. If he say, That there is a general Faith that respects Christ, that Natural Men can exercise, upon which they shall obtain Conversion and Saving Faith; I suppose any will see this is odd and strange Doctrine, to say, That there is a general Faith in Christ, and that Natural Men have it in their power to exercise it, upon which they shall infallibly obtain Saving Faith. This is to assert a Condition of obtaining the Blessings of the Covenant, prior to Saving Faith, *viz.* a general Faith, than which nothing can be grosser. *3dly:* To pray without Sloth, Deceit, Formality, Hypocrisie, seems to be Qualifications beyond what a Natural Man can attain to, and is an undue Exalting a Man's Natural Powers, beyond what the Scripture ascribes to Natural Men: For what more do real Believers attain, than to Pray without Formality, Deceit, Hypocrisie, *&c.* I would think that to pray without Formality, Hyporcisie, *&c. is to worship GOD in Spirit and Truth, Jo:* 4. 24. *And to worship Him in the Spirit, Phil.* 2. and appears to be the same with having the Conscience purged from dead Works, *Heb: 9.* 14, 15. I would know what more Qualifications are required in the Prayers of Believers. *4thly.* To expound Calling upon the LORD in Truth, *Psal.* 145. 18. as he does of moral Seriousness, is intolerably gross; For are they not the same that fear him in the 19 *Ver:* and Love him in the 20 *Ver:*? and that are of a broken Heart, *Psal.* 34. 18. to whom he is said likewise to be nigh: May not an *Arminian* this way apply

apply all the Marks of the Godly in Scripture to moral Seriouſneſs. We ſee how many Scriptures this Doctrine corrupts.

A Third Propoſition he lays down, is, *That the going about theſe Means in the Manner, juſt now deſcribed, is not above the reach of our natural Ability and Powers, were they rightly applyed and exerciſed.* This he ſays, is preſuppoſed in what our LORD teacheth, *Mat:* 7. as was explained by himſelf. *2dly.* From the Preſcription of Means for obtaining the firſt Grace, to theſe who want it. For according to him, it is unaccountable to ſay, People ſhould uſe Means for obtaining the firſt Grace, which yet they cannot uſe, till they have got it; becauſe it is above their Natural Ability to make uſe of them, which is in Effect as much, as to ſay, there are no Means appointed of GOD with a Promiſe of Succeſs, that People can uſe for obtaining renewing Grace, till they be firſt renewed. And if there be no Promiſe of Succeſs to the uſe of Means before Regeneration, no Perſon can go about them with ſo much as an Hiſtorical Faith of Succeſs, until he know that he is regenerated.

UPON this Propoſition we offer theſe Conſiderations. *1ſt.* If, to affirm that the uſing the Means in the Manner above deſcribed, as Reading and Hearing the Word, with Attention, Meditation, to Pray with Seriouſneſs, Sincerity and Faith of being heard, in Oppoſition to Sloth, Hypocriſie, Deceit and Formality; is not above our Natural Ability and Powers, be not to exalt Men's Natural Powers very much, and inconſiſtent with the Deſcription of Man's Natural Enmity and Impotency the Scripture gives; As alſo, upon

pon the Matter to deny Original Sin, any may judge. For what is this elſe, than to prepare the Heart to ſeek GOD, which is given as a Character of the truly Godly, 2 *Chro.* 30. 19. for which *David* prays, 1 *Chro.* 29. in the behalf of *Iſrael*, *Ver*: 18. and which is ſaid to be entirely GOD's Work. *Pſal.* 10. 17. and *Prov.* 16. 2*dly*. Is it not given as a Mark of *Rehoboam*'s Unſoundneſs, that he had not prepared his Heart to ſeek GOD; So that preparing the Heart to ſeek GOD, is a diſtinguiſhing Mark of the truly Godly; And therefore, if to read and pray in the foreſaid Manner be in Mens Power, the Exerciſe of Saving Grace is in Men's Power alſo, for I cannot Diſtinguiſh betwixt the Exerciſe of Saving Grace, and praying with the foreſaid Qualifications. 3*dly*. If Men can uſe their Natural Powers, to meditate, pray without Hypocriſie, *&c.* Then they need not any Aſſiſtance of Grace, either Saving or Common to help them to meditate, and they need not ſeek the Aſſiſtance of the Spirit to help them to pray without Formality or Hypocriſie; becauſe as Mr. *Simſon* ſays, it is within the reach of their Natural Powers. And further, if they can meditate and hear with Attention; Then it ſeems, *the Carnal Mind is not at ſuch Enmity againſt GOD*, *Rom*: 8. 7. And that the Imagination of the Heart is not only and continually evil, *Gen.* 6. Nor are Mens Minds ſo alienated, *Col.* 1. 21. And if they can pray without Formality, Hypocriſie, *&c.* then the Apoſtles Deſcription of Man's Natural State, *Rom*: 3. *There is none that calleth upon Thee* is too harſh, ſince they can pray without Hypocriſie, 4*thly*. To ſay, that Men of themſelves can

can ſo rightly apply and exerciſe their Natural Powers, is certainly to exalt Corrupt Nature very much; and contradicts the Experience of Believers, who find themſelves ſo far from exerciſing their Powers right, that they find they cannot *think one good Thought*, 2 *Cor*: 3. 5*thly*. I want to know, if they need common Aids of the Spirit, thus to pray without Deceit, Formality, *&c.* If they need, then to pray ſo, is not in their Power, as he ſuppoſes: Beſides, if they be to pray for that common Aſſiſtance; I would know how they are to pray? If they are to pray for it without Deceit, Formality, *&c.* This plainly ſuppoſes, they have theſe Qualifications, before they get them: Beſides, this opens a Door to *Progreſſus in infinitum*. If they need not common Aids of the Spirit, ſo to pray; let any judge how groſs this is! And if this be not to deſtroy the Economy of the Spirit, as to his common Operations? In a Word, it is of a Piece with his Doctrine upon Providence, or *Concurſus*. For he ſays, *To do Actions not above Mens natural Powers; ſuch as praying without Formality, Hypocriſie*, &c. According to Mr. *Simſon*; *Men need only to be put in ſuch Circumſtances, wherein a Train of Motives ſuitable to their Diſpoſition, meets them*. To conclude, it ſeems, That a Prayer not proceeding from feigned Lips, is not peculiar to the Godly, *Pſal*: 17. 1. For certainly to pray without Hypocriſie, *&c.* is to pray with unfeigned Lips.

As to his *firſt* Reaſon from *Matt*: 7. 7. Any may judge of the Strength thereof from what hath been above ſaid. 2*dly*. The Preſcription of Means for obtaining the firſt Grace, doth not prove

prove, That the giving of it, is infallibly linked with any Thing natural Men can do; only it points out, that GOD deals with them, as with Rational Creatures. 2*dly*. What is the ordinary Way, in which GOD conveys converting Grace? 3*dly*. What is their Duty, to be lying in the Way of these Means, by which GOD works? 4*thly*. Because while they are lying in the Use of the Means, they are in a fair and probable Way of obtaining Grace; which (if natural Men understood their Misery) they would see it to be the Effect of Infinite Mercy, to be put into such a State, wherein Salvation is possible. 3*dly*. It is not so unaccountable for GOD to prescribe Means to natural Men, which they cannot use rightly, till converted; because the Law is the Rule of Mens Duty, abstract from their Power, which they have now lost: Because tho' they cannot use them rightly; yet while they are lying in the Use of Means, GOD frequently prevents them with converting Grace, and they can never expect it in the Neglect of these Means, which is sufficient to justifie GOD's appointing Means for obtaining Conversion, tho' they can neither use the Means, as they ought, nor Conversion follow infallibly upon any Thing they can do. 4*thly*. It is a Thing very certain, That there is no infallible Promise of Converting Grace, to any Use of Means, a natural Man can go about; as we have before shewed, and shall further shew: And this we must firmly hold, unless we destroy the Sovereignity of Mercy, in shewing Grace to whom he pleases: For, otherwise it is in Man's Power, to obtain Mercy, and to escape Hardning; since

ince it is in his Power, when ever he pleaſes, to e morally ſerious; whereupon he ſhall be infalli-ly converted, and eſcape Hardning, which is ontrary to *Rom.* 9. *5thly.* If the *poſſible*, and uch more the *probable* Proſpect of the Succeſs of Means, to accompliſh any worldly Deſign, be a ufficient Encouragement in the Uſe of theſe Means, hould it not be much more here? Would he not e thought fooliſh, who would neglect Trading, ecauſe it hath no infallible Connection with ma-ing him Rich. *6thly.* Such may have a probable Hope of Succeſs; but cannot have any Hiſtorical Faith of having Succeſs; becauſe there is no infal-ible Connection, betwixt any thing they can do in hat State, and Regeneration; becauſe there is no romiſe for it; for all the Promiſes belong only o them, that are in a State of Grace. Now an Hiſtorical Faith, altho' it be but a common Grace, yet it reſpects a Divine Authority for it's oundation, no leſs than a Saving Faith; tho' in ts Actings it differs vaſtly from Saving Faith.

A fourth Propoſition he lays down, is, *That here are Means, and Motives laid before Sinners, by he Providence of GOD, and eſpecially by his Word, hich are excellently well fitted for begetting in them Hiſtorical Faith, while they are unconverted: And for xciting in them a ſerious Concern about their Sal-ation; and for working on their Hopes and Fears, ith reſpect to a future State of Happineſs or Miſery, nd for convincing them, that they are in continual Danger of falling into Hell, which is an evil infinit-y greater than all worldly Calamities*, &c. He ſays lſo, *That there are proper Arguments to convince them, f their need of Divine Grace to renew their Natures,*

and

and to convert them to GOD in Christ, &c. *All which Means, and the like; if People in their natural State would apply their Minds unto, and seriously consider, they would be moved with Fear and Care, about their Eternal State, and be convinced of their Need of Christ, and of his Grace, to convert and save them, and would be moved to cry to GOD for it, as seriously and earnestly, as the Mariners in the Ship with* Jonah *cried to their Gods, to save their Lives: Or, the People of* Nineveh *did to spare their City; which if they should do,* he thinks, *GOD would grant them his Spirit, according to our LORD's Promise.* And says further, *Altho' there be in their Asking, nothing of Merit, nor even so much as these Qualifications required in the like Duties, when performed by a Believer; yet they are accepted, and blessed with Success promised through Jesus Christ, according to the Terms of the Covenant of Redemption; which Way all other Duties must be accepted, that do preceed Justification.*

HERE is indeed Doctrine dangerous, tending to exalt Man's free Will, and to overturn the Grace of GOD in the Gospel: 1st. We remark, That in all the Use of Means by natural Men, and their Seriousness in them, he speaks not a Word of the common Operations and Motions of the Spirit upon the Hearts of natural Men, whereby they are put upon the Use of Means, and Fears and Concern about a future State are wrought in them; so that it seems, he ascribes all these, *viz. Historical Faith*, a serious Concern about their Salvation, Hopes and Fears about a future State; Conviction of their Danger, *&c.* Intirely to Mens free Wills;

for

for here he hath not a Word of the Spirit's working; ſo that he aſcribes pretty much to Mens free Will, and Men can do every Thing that is preparatory to Converſion till it come to the giving of a Principle of ſpiritual Life, which is contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith*, which tells us, *That Men, not only cannot convert themſelves; but alſo that they cannot prepare themſelves thereto*: And beſides there will be no need of the Spirit's Preſence, in any preparatory Work; but only when converting Grace is given. 2*dly*. He founds the Succeſs of theſe Means, for begetting Hiſtorical Faith, upon their being fitted for this End; So that the bare external Means, without any other Cauſe, are ſufficient to work Hiſtorical Faith, and a ſerious Concern in them about their Salvation, *&c.* 3*dly*. It ſeems, That it's in the Power of natural Men, to think ſeriouſly; a thing that Belivers find by Experience, is not in their Power. 4*thly*. It ſeems, That Danger of Hell and Wrath, is the chief Motive affecting the Sinner with Fear and Concern about his Salvation; and ſo the principal Ground of his Sorrow for Sin, more than the intrinſick Evil that is in Sin, or the Diſhonour thereby done to the Great GOD; which is agreeable enough, to his Doctrine concerning Man's ultimate End: But it's a Queſtion, If that Sorrow for Sin, can be ſaid to be without Hypocriſie, where the chief Motive of a Man's Trouble for Sin, is the Apprehenſion of Puniſhment. 5*thly*. He ſuppoſes, That it is in Mens Power, to apply their Minds to conſider ſeriouſly all the Means; which I conceive is to exalt Man's Free-will too much: For

if ſo, then they are not ſo *dead in Sins and Treſpaſſes*, as *Paul* makes them, *Eph*: 2. 1. Many, it may be, that are not altogether Strangers to Religion, find it a Thing above their Strength, to think and conſider ſeriouſly. *6thly.* He makes Conviction to follow upon their thinking and conſidering, without ſpeaking a Word of the Spirit, as the Author of Conviction, *Joh*: 16. 7, 8, 9. which the Subject Matter led him to ſpeak of. *7ly.* It ſeems, That the Men of *Nineveh* were morally ſerious in his Senſe: Hence it follows, 1*ſt*. That all the *Ninevites* were true Converts, from the leaſt to the greateſt of them: For the Scripture ſays, That *from the greateſt to the leaſt of them, they cried and put on Sackcloth*: So that here, in a very little Time, is a more numerous Church, than was at *Jeruſalem*. 2*dly*. Here are more Converts and Believers, than were at *Jeruſalem*: For it's no Streach, to ſay, That the *Ninevites*, who cried, and put on Sackcloth, were more than all the Believers in *Jeruſalem* at that Time; for *Nineveh* was a City by far, greater than *Jeruſalem*: And it's ſaid, That *the* Ninevites *from the greateſt to the leaſt of them, cried to GOD*. 3*ly*. Here are more converted by *Jonah* his preaching, for two or three Days, than all the Apoſtles were inſtrumental to convert for ſome conſiderable Time; for in *Nineveh* were ſeveral Hundred Thouſands of adult Perſons, and all theſe according to Mr. *Simſon*, were morally ſerious, and ſo real Converts. 4*thly*. It's a Wonder how Religion was ſo quickly loſt among them, and not handed down to Poſterity, in a City, where were ſo many Hundred Thouſands of Converts, and

and not one Hypocrite among them: In a Word, it ſeems, That *Jonah*'s one Preaching, had more Converts, than were by the preaching of the Prieſts, Levites and Prophets in all *Iſrael*: For it's no Breach of Charity, to ſay, That there were not ſo many Believers in all *Iſrael*, as there were Adult Perſons in *Nineveh*; and all theſe were (according to Mr. *Simſon*) morally ſerious, and ſo Believers.

7. Whether there be any Promiſe of converting Grace made to moral Seriouſneſs, may be judged from what hath been already ſaid: But further, according to Mr. *Simſon*, here is a Promiſe of converting Grace made to Asking, with moral Seriouſneſs. Now I would know, to what Covenant ſuch a Promiſe, ſuſpended upon ſuch a Condition belongs? It cannot belong to the *Covenant of Grace:* becauſe that hath no other Condition, than *ſaving Faith*, as all ſound Divines grant; and is plain from our *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſms*, and ſuch are ſuppoſed, yet to want Faith; yea, it's the Thing here promiſed: Therefore it muſt needs belong to the *Covenant of Works*: For *moral Seriouſneſs is a Work*, or Complication of many Works; and this is the Condition of obtaining the firſt Promiſe of the *Covenant*, viz. *converting Grace*, there would have been no Merit in the *Covenant of Works*, though *Adam* had ſtood, only Works would have been the Condition of Life, as *moral Seriouſneſs* according to Mr. *Simſon*, *is the Condition of converting Grace.*

8. To ſay, *That any Duties of natural Men are accepted, before they be juſtifyed*, is ſtrange; for the Acceptance of the Perſon, goes before the

Acceptance of the Duty: Yea, if we may judge of the Acceptance, by the Benefit that follows thereupon; the Acceptance of *moral Seriousness* is greater, at leſt as great, as the Acceptance of any *ſaving Act of Grace*, performed by a Believer; for the firſt is rewarded with a new State, and a new Nature and *ſaving Faith*, and what can a Believer obtain greater? For *converting Grace* ſecures all, yea, the Promiſe of *converting Grace* is not ſo free as the Promiſe of Pardon; for this laſt is ſuſpended upon *Faith*, and is free according to *Paul*, *Rom.* 4. 16. Whereas the firſt is ſuſpended upon Works or ſeeking with *moral Seriouſneſs*. *9thly.* To ſay, *That the Duties of natural Men, are accepted through Chriſt*; and ſo far as to be rewarded with *ſaving Grace*, while they themſelves are not united to him by *ſaving Faith*, is new and ſtrange Doctrine indeed: This is to make Hiſtorical Faith in Chriſt, to draw alongſt with it ſuch a Degree of Acceptance, as is infallibly followed with *converting Grace*: So that the Acceptance upon *Hiſtorical Faith*, is as great as Acceptance upon *ſaving Faith*. *Laſtly*, There are new Terms in the *Covenant of Redemption never before heard of*, viz. *That all that are morally ſerious ſhall be infallibly converted*: This is to found the firſt Application of Grace to us, upon Works, contrary to *Tit.* 3. 5. For, if upon *moral Seriouſneſs*, we be infallibly converted, than we are ſaved and regenerated by Works of Righteouſneſs. I think there can be nothing plainer than the Contradiction of this Doctrine to that Text.

A Fifth Propoſition he lays down is, *That although, it doth not exceed Man's natural Powers, to uſe the foreſaid Means, yet the ſerious Application, and diligent Exerciſe of their Power, and the ſincere Uſe of theſe Means for obtaining* ſaving Grace, *does not depend upon, or flow from their own free Will, that is not circumſcribed and determin'd in all it's particular Actions by the eternal Decree of GOD, and his particular Providence. This he calls the* Pelagian *and* Arminian *Error on this Head, according to which we ſhould chooſe GOD firſt, not he us.*

ON the contrary he ſays, he teaches, *That all theſe Means ordinary, and extraordinary, by which any of GOD's Elect are to be converted (among which are theſe Means that preceed Regeneration) are ſpecialy determin'd in the Covenant of Redemption, and Decree of Election; in which all the ſeveral Uſes of theſe Means, and their Connexion with* ſaving Grace, *and the Perſons to be converted by them,* &c. *Are all particularly ſpecified, and determined: All which Parts of the Decree, are effectually and powerfully brought to paſs, by the particular powerful, and gracious Providence of GOD.*

BUT, *Firſt,* Though this reach not to the full Extent of *Arminian* and *Pelagian* Error; yet it it follows not that his Doctrine on that Head, is not a Branch of that Error, *viz. That it's in Man's Power to uſe the Means of Grace, with Moral Seriouſneſs, and that upon ſo doing, he ſhall infallibly be converted*: Every one that knows any Thing in this Controverſie, knows this. It's true, he and they take different Ways to defend this Error

Error; but the Error is ſtill the ſame, though ſupported by different Hypotheſes. 2*dly*. When he grants, *That the Right uſe of theſe Means, is circumſcribed by the eternal Decree*, &c. he ſays no more than would have been true of *Adam*, upon ſuppoſition he had ſtood, his Power in the right uſe of it, would have been circumſcribed by a a Decree and ſpecial Providence, and yet in that caſe, he had gotten Life by his Works: Again, he ſays no more than he muſt allow of the moſt indifferent Actions of Men; for they are all circumſcribed by an eternal Decree, and particular Providence. 3*dly*. Therefore, why ſeems he to reſtrict this bounding by the Decree, to the ſerious Application of their Powers, in the Uſe of Means; ſince the circumſcribing, by the Decree, extends it ſelf to the Uſe of Means, whether ſerious or not; yea to the very neglect of them. 4*thly*. Since he allows ſuch an eternal Decree, I would know, how he will anſwer the great Objection of Adverſaries: Seing it militates, as ſtrongly againſt the Decree; for it ſeems no great Matter, whether it be in Man's Power, or not, to uſe theſe Means aright; if it be determined by an infallible and antecedent Decree, who ſhall uſe theſe Means aright, and who not: If the Decree overturn not Man's Liberty, why ſhould not the ſame, be granted alſo of *Concurſus prævius*; for there is none, that I know of, except Mr. *Simſon* himſelf, who aſſert the Decree, and do not alſo defend this Concurſe. 5*thly*. The Decree no way hinders, but that the ſerious uſe of Means depends intirely on Mens free Will; for he himſelf in his *third Propoſition*, ſays, *This*

is

is not above the reach of Men's Natural Powers: When two Men are intending to walk in the Field, the one goes, and the other not; will any ſay, That their walking, depended not intirely upon their free Will, becauſe the going of the one, and not going of the other, were both of them circumſcribed, by an antecedent Decree. *6thly.* I would know what is it, that is decreed, when the uſe of theſe Means is decreed; it is either to bring the Means Providentially to their Hand, or the preſerving their Natural Powers, or the putting them in ſuch Circumſtances wherein ſuch a Train of Motives, ſuitable to their preſent Temper, offers to them; or it is to give internal Influences, effectually to determine them to the right uſe of the Means. The three firſt are pretty groſs, if no more be allowed in the Decree, and the laſt is ſtiffly denied by him; for he allows *Phyſicus Concurſus* in no Actions (gracious Actions excepted.) *7thly.* I would know, what is that powerful and gracious Providence, whereby the Decree is brought to paſs. Internal Operations, or a Phyſical Concurſe, he admits not, in Actions that tranſcend not Mens Natural Abilities, as it is in the caſe in Hand; and therefore it muſt be what he himſelf ſays elſewhere, by putting Men into ſuch Circumſtances, wherein ſuch a Train of Motives, *&c.* So that according to Mr. *Simſon*, all the Providence of GOD, in bringing Men to an Hiſtorical Faith, to hear with Attention, and to meditate, to be thoughtful about their Salvation, to be convinced of the Danger they are in, Pray without Formality, Hypocriſie, *&c.* conſiſts in putting them

into

into ſuch happy Circumſtances, wherein a Train of Motives, ſuitable to their Temper meets them, *&c.* For all theſe being not ſaving Actions, he will by no means allow of *Phyſicus Conſurſus*, which, if it be not a groſs kind of Doctrine, any may judge.

AND from theſe five Propoſitions, he hath laid down, *Page* 219, he draws ſome Inferences: As *Firſt, That none but the Elect, will ever apply their Natural Powers to the right uſe of the Means deſcribed, and ſo none but they will obtain Saving Grace; So that the firſt Thing, that diſtinguiſhes the Elect, from the Reprobate here upon Earth, is, That the former imploy their Natural Powers to the right uſe of theſe Means, for the obtaining the Grace of GOD in Chriſt, while the other ſlights them, or uſes them not aright, as above deſcribed.*

BUT, *Firſt*, The *Arminian* Objection dreſſed up by himſelf, recurs in full Force againſt himſelf: For what Mercy is it to the moſt Part, tho' they have an Offer of Grace upon a Condition that is in their Power, if by an antecedent Decree, it be infallibly determined, that they ſhall never uſe their Natural Powers aright to the Performance of that Condition. 2*dly*. It ſeems, That converting Grace, is not the firſt Thing, that diſtinguiſhes an Elect Perſon from a Reprobate here upon Earth; but there is ſomething before it, *viz. Moral Serioufneſs*; ſo that there is an infallible Mark of Election in Men, prior to converting Grace, and ſo before they have it, that is, while they are yet in a Natural State. 3*dly*. Tho' in that caſe, none but the Elect uſe their Natural Powers aright, yet there is

no

no more in this, than when two Men reſolving to walk Abroad, the one walketh Abroad, the other changes his Mind, and doth not walk. It was equally in the Power of both to have walked; only the Event proves, that there was a Decree that one, only, ſhould walk abroad; So there ſeems there is no more ſpecial Aſſiſtance, when one uſes the Means aright, than when the other does not; Only there is a Decree, that the one ſhall uſe the Means aright, when the other does it not, which is but groſs Doctrine. *4thly.* I would know, if the Man that uſes the Means aright, hath any ſpecial Aid, or Aſſiſtance for doing ſo, that another, who uſes them not ſo, wants. If he hath not any ſpecial Aſſiſtance, than the firſt diſtinguiſhing Mark of Election, is from the right rule of a Man's own Free Will; and ſo he diſtinguiſhes himſelf from another, contrary to 1 *Cor.* 4. 7. and is no more in GOD's Debt, for actual Aſſiſtance to the right uſe of theſe Means, than the other, who neglected the ſame, than which nothing can be more deſtructive to the freedom of the Grace of the Goſpel. If he had any ſpecial Aſſiſtance the other wanted; Then, *1ſt.* The right uſe of theſe Means is not in Natural Mens Power, which yet he himſelf affirms. *2dly.* I would know, what that ſpecial Aſſiſtance is; for it cannot be any internal Influx, for this he denies, except in Saving Acts of Grace; it muſt therefore be the putting him in ſuch Circumſtances, wherein ſuch a Train of Motives meet him. But this ſeems plainly common to both, for Men that are Reprobate, have all the external Advantages that an Elect hath; as when both

both hear the ſame Sermon, and are both taken with it, *&c.* Or will he reſolve it into the Elects being in a better Temper than the other; but is not this a flat Way of differencing the Elect from the Reprobate; for then there is ſomething that diſtinguiſhes them before the right uſe of the Means, *viz.* A better Temper in the one than the other, which ſeems to coincide with the *Arminians* Doctrine of *Semina Pietatis*, as previous to Saving Grace: Beſides, That all GOD's Providential Operation this Way, in Mens uſing the Means, is only external, and indirect.

A ſecond Inference he draws, is, *That no Perſon who uſeth his Natural Faculties, in going about theſe Means aright, and ſo obtains ſaving Grace, hath any Thing to aſcribe to himſelf, or the good Management of his own Free Will; but on the contrary hath GOD to bleſs, for giving him Counſel, and for the ſteady Conduct of his Providence, whereby he was guided, and excited in every Step, in the right uſe of theſe Means, without which he had ſlighted them as others do. And above all, he has reaſon to bleſs GOD, for the rich Promiſe of his free Grace, and his Faithful Accompliſhment thereof,* &c. *And muſt acknowledge, that he hath not any Thing, but what he hath received, and that GOD alone hath made him to differ.*

BUT, *Firſt*, If the right Management of the uſe of Means, upon which ſaving Grace is infallibly given, be not above Mens Natural Powers, and if the Man who uſeth his Natural Faculties ſo, hath no ſpecial Aſſiſtance for uſing the Means aright, which the other, which did not uſe them ſo, wanted; I ſee not how that Man hath not

ſome-

ſomething to aſcribe unto the good Management, of his own Free Will. 2*dly*. I cannot ſee how that Man doth not make himſelf differ from another, if the Right uſe of Means be in his Power, and he has no ſpecial Aſſiſtance for uſing his natural Powers in the right uſe of the Means, which the other wanted; For it is this uſe of the Means which makes him differ from another, and this is intirely from himſelf, according to Mr. *Simſon*. 3*dly*. I want to know, what GOD's giving him Counſel in the uſe of the Means is; it cannot be the internal Influence of the Spirit; for this he denies, till once a Man be converted. 4*thly*. I would know, whether this Counſel be neceſſary, that a Man uſe the Means aright, or not. I ſuppoſe he will not ſay, this Counſel is not neceſſary; if it be neceſſary, I want in the next place to know, whether every Man that enjoys the Means has that Counſel. If he hath not, then the right uſing of theſe Means is above the Natural Powers of that Man who wants it, if every Man hath that Counſel, then when the Man that uſeth the Means right, bleſſeth GOD for giving him Counſel, he hath no ſpecial Mercy to bleſs GOD for, in his uſing the Means aright, which the other wanted, if that Counſel be common to all. 5*thly*. I would know, what this ſteady Conduct of Providence is, whereby he is excited to the right uſe of Means (for he ſpeaks not one Word of the internal, and ſecret Operations of the Spirit) it is either by Way of Phyſical Concurſe; but this he denies, or by making ſuch a Train of Motives meet him: But this is only Objective, and Moral Swaſion, and common

mon alſo to the Reprobate, who may have all the external Advantages which the Elect have.

HIS third Inference is, *That there is a preparatory Work in the Souls of Sinners, which preceeds Regeneration; That by the eternal Purpoſe of GOD and the Goſpel Revelation, is neceſſarly connected with Regeneration; whereof there are Counterfeits in the Reprobate, and ſomtimes alſo in the Elect, &c. But the preparatory Work which is genuine, is never to be found, but in the Elect: and hath always Converſion following upon it.*

BUT, *1ſt.* He goes croſs to all Orthodox Divines, who allow not any infallible Connection betwixt a preparatory Work and Converſion: For this is to confound *Common*, and *Saving* Grace, as is plain, tho' GOD ordinarly paves his Way into the Soul, by a preparatory Work. *2dly.* I never thought, That a *preparatory Work*, being a common Work of the Spirit, had had any Counterfeits, this being peculiar to Saving Grace. Or, that there was any ſpecial Work in an Elect before he was converted, which might not alſo be found in a Reprobate. *3dly.* I ſuppoſe he will not deny, but the Spirit is the Author of this preparatory Work; for it is plain, from *Joh.* 16. 7, 8, 9. *&c.* In this Caſe then, I would know how the Spirit influenceth this preparatory Work, *viz.* of Conviction, Sorrow, Fear, *&c.* It muſt either be by his internal Influence and Operation upon the Souls of Men. But this he will not allow of, becauſe he denies *phyſical Concurſe* before Converſion. Or, it muſt be only by making a Train of Motives, *&c.* tryſt them, and ſuch external Providences, as ſuit their Temper.

But

But to make the Spirit the Author of this preparatory Work only in that Senſe, I ſuppoſe, is groſſer than needs to be refuted. *4thly.* How he will diſtinguiſh betwixt a genuine Work of Preparation from a Counterfeit, I conceive will be hard Work: For, I ſuppoſe, That what he calls a genuine preparatory Work, will be found to follow Converſion, and to go before Aſſurance. *5thly.* How this preparatory Work follows from his Scheme, I ſee not: For if the right Uſe of the Means be in Man's Power, and ſo Conviction, Contrition, deep Sorrow for Sin, and a Willingneſs to part with it, I ſee no Need of the Spirit's Operation to work theſe Things in a Man; and it is to the Spirit that this preparatory Work is aſcribed: In a Word, a preparatory Work is in Man's own Power; and ſo a Man can prepare himſelf, or put himſelf in ſuch a Frame, as Converſion infallibly follows thereupon, which is plainly contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith*, which ſays, That a Man can neither convert himſelf, nor prepare himſelf thereunto.

A Fourth Inference he draws, *Pag.* 220. is, *That all the reſt of the World, who ſlight and reject theſe Means, are left utterly inexcuſable; becauſe they do not what is within the Reach of their natural Powers; which if they did, they ſhould obtain* ſaving Grace. And ſays, *That they have no better Excuſe in this Caſe, than they would have for ſlighting the neceſſary Means of their Health and Life, or of promoting the Good of their Families, which Providence lays to their Hand.*

BUT, *1ſt.* How according to his own Way of

of Reaſoning, they are without Excuſe I ſee not: For, If there be an eternal Decree, That they ſhall not uſe their natural Powers aright, it is no great Matter, whether it be in their Power to uſe the Means right or not; the Argument of Adverſaries ſtrikes as much againſt the Decree, as the Want of Power. 2*dly*. Then it ſeems, it is as much in their Power to uſe the Means of Grace, aright, *i. e.* to pray without Formality and Hypocriſie, to meditate, to be convinced of, and troubled for Sin, *&c.* as it is in their Power to uſe the Means of their natural Health. If this be not an exalting of Mens free Will, any may judge. 3*dly*. The obtaining of *ſaving Grace* is as much in their Power, as the preſerving of their natural Health: For according to him, the right Uſe of the Means of the firſt, is as much in their Power, as the right uſing of the Means of their natural Health is; and if ſo, it is not only, not difficult, but very eaſy to get *ſaving Grace*. 4*thly*. Then it ſeems all GOD's Providence and Operations about Man in his right uſing the Means, is only external by laying the outward Means of Grace to his Hand; even as when Providence lays Occaſions before a Man of promoting the good of his Family: This is lax Doctrine indeed.

HIS Fifth Inference *Pag*: 220 is, That by this Method our Doctrine of Election and Reprobation, of the Extent of GOD's eternal Decree, and particular Providence, as to all Things that come to paſs, and the Doctrine of particular Grace, deſigned, purchas'd for, and beſtowed on the Elect

Elect alone, remains ſafe and untouch'd; and all *Pelagian* and *Arminian* Objections againſt effectual Calling, *&c.* ſuch as the Outward Call to repent and believe, the Offer of Grace made in common to the Elect and Reprobate, are according to him intirely cut off, and they have nothing to object againſt this Part of our Doctrine, but what they bring againſt GOD's Decree in all Things unchangeable.

BUT, *1ſt.* It is plain, That one Side of this Doctrine is *Arminian*, and the other *Calviniſt*; ſo that it is a Mungrel Scheme, and like the Children of the *Jewes*, that ſpake half the Language of *Aſhdod*, and half the *Jewes* Language. *2dly.* How our Doctrine of Election, is preſerved I ſee not: For *1ſt.* According to him, the Object of Election is Man, conſidered and foreſeen as uſing the Means with *moral Seriouſneſs*, which deſtroys the Freedom of Election, and in the uſing of theſe Means there is nothing decreed, but the laying of ſuch *a Train of Motives before them.* *2dly.* He plainly aſſerts Chriſt to be the Cauſe of the Decree of Election. *3dly* He acknowledges, That the *Arminian* Objection againſt the Call to repent and believe made to all, militates againſt our Doctrine concerning Man's Impotency as to the right Uſe of Means. Now if it be ſtrong againſt this; it is ſtrong alſo againſt the infallible Decree; and if it be not ſtrong againſt the Decree, neither is it againſt the other: For *phyſical Concurſe*, no more deſtroys Man's Liberty, than the Decree. *4thly.* It is a new Way of defending our Doctrine *viz.* to betray one Half of it to our Enemies, to defend

defend the other as Mr. *Simſon* does. I much doubt, That they who maintain his Scheme about effectual Calling, are at the Bottom found about the Decrees, if they underſtand and conſider the Connection the one hath with the other: For, I never heard of any that maintained our Doctrine, as to the Decree, but who alſo maintain'd our Doctrine as to the *phyſical Concurſe*, nor of any who oppoſed our Doctrine as to this Concurſe, but who alſo oppoſed our Doctrine as to the Decree.

HE ſays, *Pag*: 222. *That Mr.* Rutherford *in his* Examen Arminianiſmi, Pag: 334, 335. *refutes not this Doctrine concerning* effectual Calling *in that Shape wherein he hath dreſſed it*; and ſays, *That he hath not one Argument, that in the leaſt weakens what he hath ſaid.*

IT ſeems this Scheme is new and intirely his own Invention and ἔυρημα So that according as he hath been heard to ſay, he deſerves Thanks for his Service he hath done; but whether he hath done Service, and deſerves Thanks, for betraying ſo many of our Doctrines into the Enemies Hands, any may judge. 2*dly*. I wonder of his Boldneſs in aſſirming, That *Rutherford* hath not refuted this Doctrine in the Shape in which he hath dreſſed it; I ſhall ſet down the Queſtion as ſtated by Mr. *Rutherford*, *Pag:* 334. of that Book; His Words are, *Vera Quæſtio eſt, nempe, An ulla ſit in Homine Conditio, Cauſa, Meritum vel Ratio, qua poſita DEUS infallibiliter Hominem convertat* &c. Is not this the ſame with Mr. *Simſon*'s Doctrine, That GOD hath infallibly promiſed Grace to the *morally ſe-*

rious

ious: It is plain alſo from his third State of the Queſtion, *viz. An ex Parte Hominis detur Conditio moralis ex Officio poſtulata ab eo*, &c. *qua poſita, ſi tempe Homo, vel Viribus Naturæ, vel Auxilio Gratiæ communioris eam Conditionem impleat, DEUS reveatur, vel ex communi Æquitate et Juſtitia, vel ex ſpeciali Lege in Chriſto Mediatore, ejuſque Meritorum Vi et Virtute facta, vel ex liberali Pacto et Promiſſione, ad infallibiliter dandum*, &c. *vel ad ipſam Converſionem præſtandum*, &c. From which it is plain That Mr *Rutherford* impugns any Conditions required on Man's Part upon which Converſion infallibly follows; whether his Arguments be of Force I ſhall leave to any to judge, who ſhall peruſe the Place above cited.

He denies, *Pag:* 222. That this Connection betwixt the unrenewed Man's Works, and ſaving Grace is contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith Chap:* 10. §. 2. And ſays, *That it is not amongſt the* Arminian *Errors condemned by the Synod of* Dort; *But is it not expreſly contrary to the* Confeſſion of Faith, *Chap:* 9. §. 3. Where it is ſaid, *That Man by his own Strength can neither convert himſelf, nor prepare himſelf thereunto*: Now if *Moral Serioufneſs* be in Man's Power, and converting Grace follow infallibly thereupon, and be promiſed thereto; will any ſay, but that it is in Man's Power, to prepare himſelf for converting Grace? 2*dly*. It is no leſs contrary to *Chap.* 10. §. 2. Where *the Effectual Call is ſaid to be of GOD's free and ſpecial Grace alone, not from any Thing at all foreſeen in Man.* Now, If it be in Man's Power to be *morally ſerious*, and If he who is ſo have no ſpecial Aſſiſtance that another, who is not *morally Serious*

wanted, ſure that Man who is *morally Serious* no more in GOD's Debt for being *morally Seri-ous*, than the other who was not ſo, ſince he ha no Aſſiſtance the other wanted, and ſo his Con verſion is not altogether free. Again, 2*dly*. I Man be conſidered, when the Object of the De cree to convert, in the ſame Circumſtances i which he is in when converted, then in the De cree to convert, he is conſidered, as being about t uſe the Means with *Moral Serioufneſs*: But thi Mr. *Simſon* affirms; and therefore Man when con verted, being clothed with Moral Seriouſneſs i foreſeen, and conſidered as ſuch in the Decree t convert. 3*dly*. As to the Synod of *Dort*, to ſhew how confident he is without Ground, I ſhall cit one Place or two. 1*ſt*. *Pag*: 297. of that Book *De Hominis Corruptione et Converſione*, *Art*. 3. Th Words are, *Itaque omnes Homines in Peccato concipi untur, et Filii Iræ naſcuntur inepti ad omne bonum ſalutare* &c. *et abſque Spiritus Sancti regenerantis Gra tia ad DEUM redire, Naturam depravatam corrige re, vel ad ejus Correctionem ſe diſponere, nec volum nec poſſunt*. 2*dly*. In the following fourth Article *Sed tantum abeſt, ut hoc Naturæ Lumine ad Saluta rem DEI Cognitionem pervenire, et ad DEUM ſ convertere poſſit, ut ne quidem eo in Naturalibus a Civilibus recte utatur*. 3ly. *Art*: 10. *Quod auten alii per Miniſterium Evangelii vocati convertantur id non eſt adſcribendum Homini tanquam ſeipſum, pe liberum Arbitrum ab aliis pari, vel ſufficienti Gra tia, ad Salutem et Converſionem inſtructus diſcernent* (*quod ſuperba* Pelagii *Hæreſis ſtatuit*) *ſed DEO*, &c *Laſtly*, He ſays, *Converting Grace is not the leſs free that GOD promiſes to give it to them that ask; no*

it from any thing foreseen in Man, seing their asking the Fruit of GOD's Eternal Purpose.

But, *1st.* Though it be of Grace, that GOD ould annex the Promise to such a Condition, yet the Condition be in the Power of Men, in that ase when one fulfils the Condition, and the o- er not, sure the fulfilling of the Promise is t intirely of Grace to him, that fulfils e Condition. *2dly.* He says no more than *rminians* say; for they acknowledge, That it is race for GOD to make such a Promise; but yet y, *The Condition upon which the Promise is suspended, within the Reach of Man's natural Powers.* *3dly.* e says no more in this Case, than would have en upon Supposition *Adam* had continued in his bedience: For even in that Case, the making ch a great Promise to *Adam*'s Obedience would ve been of Grace; and his perfect Obedience ould have also been the Fruit of an Eternal De- ee, as well as asking is in the Power of natural len. *4thly.* If an *Arminian* should put the Act of aith in the Room of *Moral Seriousness*, and allow- g the Decree, as Mr. *Simson* does, should say, hat Faith is as much in Man's Power, as *Moral riousness* is, according to Mr. *Simson*; in that ase Faith being the Condition of Justification, ould any deny, but that our Justification would ot be altogether free, in a Gospel Sense, tho' here were still some Grace in annexing the Pri- ilege of Justification to an Act of believing.

But in the last Place we shall offer some Reasons gainst this Doctrine that is new to this Church; *st.* It plainly Destroys the common Notions of hings, for I am sure, it was always acknowledged,

and ſuppoſed, that *Moral Serioufneſs* was a thin
common, both to the Elect and Reprobate an
that Men might be *morally Serious*, who neithe
have, nor ever came to have Saving Grace. 2*dly*.
want to know what he means by *moral Seriou*
neſs, for I am confident, that when it comes to b
deſcribed, it will either be found oftimes to b
where Converſion never follows; or if it be exte
ded further, it will be found to follow Converſ
on, and to be the Real exerciſe of Saving Grac
3*dly*. I would know what he makes the Qualific
tions of a *morally Serious* Prayer? If it t ke in ea
neſt, importunate and unfeigned Deſires of Savi
Grace; But will any Orthodox ſay, That ſuch De
ſires are not above the Reach of our Natural Pow
ers, which Believers themſelves find ſo great a Di
ficulty in reaching unto. Further, when N
tural Men deſire Saving Grace, they either deſi
it only as it keeps them out of Hell; but ſuch
deſire is frequently where Grace never follows
or for it ſelf, and as it is a Branch of their Ha
pineſs and Conformity to GOD: But this la
all Orthodox grant to be the Fruit and Ev
dence of a converted State. Again can any rea
ly deſire Saving Grace that is not heartily w
ling to part with every ſin, and wearied of a B
dy of Death; but can a Man be heartily willi
to part with all ſin, till he be firſt converte
for this ſuppoſes an Heart Reconciled to t
whole Law; and conſequently converting Grac
Laſtly, When he makes it in a Man's Power
pray with the Faith of being heard; I would kno
what Faith that is? it muſt either be *Hiſtori*
Faith, or a *Saving Faith*: The firſt cannot
ſa

id: For this were to make *Hiſtorical Faith* an fallible ſign of Saving Grace, and peculiar to e Elect, which is contrary both to Scripture, and all Orthodox Divines, who maintain an *Hiſtorical Faith* to be in Hypocrites; it cannot be *Saving Faith*, for they are ſuppoſed to want it.

4. I would know, whether it be to the leaſt eaſure of *Moral Serioufneſs*, and Act thereof? Or, 2*dly*. To a certain Train of Acts of *Moral Serioufneſs*? Or, 3*dly*. To the higheſt Meaſure of attainable? Or, 4*thly*. To *Moral Serioufneſs* erſevered in, that the Promiſe of Converſion is ade? If the firſt, I want to know the partiular Act of *Moral Serioufneſs* upon which Conerſion infallibly follows; but this can never be condeſcended on: Beſides, that *Moral Seriouſneſs* in it ſelf is a Complication of many Acts: the ſecond, I want to know the Number of theſe Acts that go to make up the Condition of converting Grace, which I ſuppoſe will be a difficult Task? The third can as little be aſſerted, becauſe it is certain, That all that are converted have not been equally *morally Serious*; beſides that perfect *Moral Serioufneſs* ſeems to look like the Condition of the Covenant of Works. The fourth cannot be, becauſe Men would never be converted till once they were Dead.

5. THIS Doctrine is plainly contrary to the Scripture; will any deny but that *Ahab* was *Morally Serious*, 1 *Kings* 21. 29. and they in the 78 *Pſalm*, *Morally Serious*, and that the five fooliſh Virgins were ſo, *Mat*: 25. And the Stony Ground Hearers who *received the Word with Joy*, and the Rich Young Man, *Mark* 10. who came ſo great

a length in Religion; And these in *Isa.* 58. I
seems we must go to School again, and learn t
understand the common Terms of Divinity.

6. THIS seems to be a plain exalting of Man'
Natural Powers, and Free-Will too much, for here
by that Preparatory Work which all Divines a
scribe to the internal Operation of the Spirit i
made to be within the Compass of Man's ow
Free-Will; so that Conviction for sin, inwar
and deep Trouble for it, fears of Wrath, som
Desires after, and Thoughtfulness about Salvat
on, praying without Formality, Hypocrisy, De
ceit, Sloth, *&c.* are as much in Man's Powe
(to keep by his own Words) as the using th
Natural Means for preserving his own Life an
Health; so that these things being in a Man'
Power, he needs not pray to be convinced an
troubled for sin; if this be not to overthrow tha
Branch of the Spirit's Oeconomy as to his com
mon and preparatory Operations upon the Con
sciences of Natural Men; any may judge; for ac
cording to Mr. *Simson*, they are not above th
Reach of their Natural Powers; and he himse
allows no Physical Influence or Concurse till Me
be converted, so that as to all these foresaid Du
ties and Qualifications Natural Men want onl
to be put in such Circumstances, wherein suc
a Train of Motives suteable to their present Tem
per meet them; sure if Men can do all thes
Things, their Nature is not so far debased an
alienated from GOD as the Scripture makes plai
it is, if they can prepare themselves in such
Manner, as Conversion infallibly follows there
upon.

7. HE makes a true Preparatory Work to have it's Counterfeits; but I ever thought that there had been Counterfeits of nothing but of Saving Grace. And I want to know the differencing Ingredients of a true Preparatory Work, diſtinguiſhing it from a Counterfeit preparatory Work on the one Hand, and from Saving Grace on the other; for I ſuppoſe, That it will fall in either with the one, or the other.

8. THIS is to make an infallible Connection betwixt Things of a different Order and Kind, betwixt Nature and Grace, which all Orthodox Divines deny. There is indeed ſuch a Connection betwixt Things of the ſame Kind, as betwixt one Act of Grace and another; but I never heard, That Acts of meer Nature were infallibly linked together with Saving Grace.

9. THIS makes it as eaſie for Natural Men to get Heaven, as it was for *Adam* to have fulfilled the Condition of the Covenant of Works: For he himſelf ſays, *That it is as much in Mens Power to uſe the Means with Moral Seriouſneſs, as it is in their Power to uſe the Means of their Health*: So that it is as eaſie for Men to get Heaven, as to uſe the Natural Means of preſerving their Health.

10. THIS Doctrine ſeems to be the very ſame with *Arminian* Doctrine upon this Head, or not much different from it; for it is no great Matter whether it be affirmed, that Men have a Power to believe; or to ſay, that indeed it is not in their Power to believe; but that yet it is in their Power to do that upon which they ſhall infallibly get Saving Faith: The laſt is the ſame with the

the first; only it is a little smooth'd, and agrees with what the more modest among the *Arminians* say, *viz. If Men improve common Grace they shall get Saving*. I would think it is no great Matter whether one say, That such a Man is able to pay all his Debt, or to say he is not able indeed to pay it, but it is in his Power to desire one to do it, who will thereupon infallibly pay his Debt; this is plainly the *Arminian* Doctrine, *Habenti Dabitur*.

11. THIS is to send Men first to themselves (not to free Grace) that they may trade with, and improve their Natural Talents and Powers to be *morally Serious*, in order to get *Saving Grace*; and so to derive the first distinguishing Application of *Saving Grace* from the right Improvement of their own Natural Powers, which I would think sounds very harsh.

12. I would know, when one Man improves his Natural Powers to be *morally Serious*, whether he hath any more Assistance than another, who doth not so improve his Natural Powers? If he have, then this plainly destroys his Supposition, that it is not above Mens Natural Powers to be *morally Serious*: If he have not, then the Man that improves his Powers to be *Morally Serious*, is no more obliged to GOD for being *morally serious*, and so for obtaining Saving Grace, than the other who did not so improve his natural Powers; and thereby he plainly makes himself differ from another, contrar to 1 *Cor:* 4. 7. for it was equally in the Power of the other to have been *morally serious*, and so to have obtained *Saving Grace:* And the first had no Assistance

ance in being *morally ſerious* that the other wanted; nor doth the Decree ſalve the Matter here, as we ſhewed already; for there is no ſpecial Aid decreed to be given to the one more than the other, and the Decree falls not under Conſideration here in the Uſe of Mens Natural Powers. Beſides that the Decree extends it ſelf equally to the moſt indifferent Actions of Men, which are all equally bounded by the eternal Decree, ſo that here is no Speciality.

13. This is to make *Moral Seriouſneſs* a Condition, *Firſt*, Of far more Moment than Saving Faith it ſelf: For upon it, according to Mr. *Simſon*, Converſion and all Saving Graces, and even Faith it ſelf are ſuſpended as a Condition. *2dly.* This is to make a Condition of the Covenant before Faith, *to wit*, *Moral Seriouſneſs*, which is the Condition of obtaining Faith it ſelf, which I think new Doctrine, and contrar to the *Confeſſion of Faith, and Larger Catechiſm* upon that Queſtion, *How is the Grace of GOD manifeſted in the ſecond Covenant*? where it only mentions Faith as the Condition. *3dly.* This is conſequently to make a twofold Condition of the Covenant of Grace, *to wit*, firſt *Moral Seriouſneſs*, and then Faith. *4thly.* This is to make *Moral Seriouſneſs* a more proper Condition of Converſion (a Thing of as great Moment as Juſtification) than Faith is of Juſtification; for Faith is only a Condition relatively, with Reference to it's Object Chriſt, as it lays hold on his Righteouſneſs; but *Moral Seriouſneſs* having no ſuch Object, muſt needs be a Condition conſidered as a Work in the ſame Senſe, that Works were the Condition of the

firſt

first Covenant: And there being but two Conditions mentioned in Scripture, *viz.* Faith and Works, *Moral Seriousness* must needs fall under the one, which must of Neceſſity be Works. *Laſtly*, This is to turn the Covenant of Grace, at leaſt the firſt Promiſe of it, into a Covenant of Works; for the Promiſe of Converſion is the firſt Promiſe: And this according to Mr. *Simſon* is made to, and infallibly ſuſpended upon *Moral Seriouſneſs*, which is a Complication of Works; Which I think pretty groſs: Beſides, that hereby he denies all Abſolute Promiſes, as we before obſerved.

LASTLY, this is expreſly contrary to the Scripture, which aſcribes the Preparation of the Heart to GOD, as *Pſal.* 10. 17. *Thou will prepare their Hearts*, *Prov:* 16. 1. *The Preparation of the Heart, and the Anſwer of the Tongue is from the LORD.* 1 *Chron.* 29. 18. Where *David* prays, *That GOD may Prepare His Peoples Heart unto Himſelf.* Now if it be in Mens power to Prepare their Hearts for Converſion, *i. e.* to be *morally Serious*, they need not pray to GOD for preparation for Converſion.

WE ſhall conclude this Chapter with theſe two or three following Conſiderations, 1*ſt*. Will any ſay That all theſe things that Mr. *Mede* deſcribes in his *Almoſt Chriſtian* (which alſo are to be found in other Divines) are within the reach of Natural Mens Powers; and will any ſay that ſuch a Perſon as hath theſe things ſpecified in that little Book, is not *morally Serious*. 2*dly*. I would know if GOD might not require Natural Men to ſeek Converting Grace, and yet not Annex the Promiſ

miſe of converting Grace infallibly to their ſeeking with *Moral Serioufneſs*; if he might have done it, then the Objection of *Arminians* he ſo much Magnified falls to the Ground, if he could not require it without annexing the Promiſe of Converſion to ſome Condition within their Power, then this ſays that GOD could not make a new Covenant with Man, without putting the Condition of it within his Power, either directly or indirectly, but this is plainly *Arminian* Doctrine, and to make the Covenant of Grace only a Mitigation of the Covenant of Works, not a ſpecifically diſtinct Covenant; for it founds a Mans Title to the firſt Promiſe upon ſomething performed by him in the ſtrength of his own Natural Powers. 3*dly*. This Poſition plainly ſuppoſes univerſal Grace given to all Men who hear the Word, upon the right Improvement of which they infallibly get Saving Grace. 4*thly*. and *laſtly*, This Doctrine plainly deſtroys the freedom of converting Grace, for though it be granted to be Grace, to annex the Promiſe of Converſion to *Moral Serioufneſs*, yet that this Man is converted, and not another, is no ſpecial Grace, becauſe the Condition of *Moral Serioufneſs* upon which the Promiſe of Converſion is ſuſpended, was equally in the Power of both of them, and the Man that improved the means to be *morally Serious* had no ſpecial aſſiſtance that the other wanted; ſo that albeit the annexing of the Promiſe upon ſuch a Condition was of Grace, yet the Implementing of it to him, who is *morally Serious*, is of Works, as having uſed his Natural Powers well, which the other did not: How Dangerous and Peſtiferous ſuch Doctrine muſt be,

any

any who is nor altogether a Stranger to the Grace of the Goſpel, may ſee. In a Word, the Promiſe of converting Grace this way, is not ſo free as the Promiſe of Pardon, which is plain. For, 1*ſt*. The Promiſe that is ſuſpended upon a Condition, that is within the reach of Mens Natural Powers, is certainly not ſo free as a Promiſe that is ſuſpended upon a Condition, wrought by ſupernatural Grace; but the Promiſe of converting Grace, is ſuſpended upon ſuch a Condition, *viz*. *Moral Serioufneſs*, whereas the Condition of Pardon, *viz*. Faith, is not in the Power of Natural Men. 2*dly*. That Promiſe which is ſuſpended upon Works, as the Condition thereof, is not ſo free as the Promiſe that is ſuſpended upon Faith; But this way the Promiſe of converting Grace is ſuſpended upon Works, as the condition thereof; for *Moral Serioufneſs* is a Complication of Works. 3*dly*. Thereby all the Promiſes of the Goſpel are ultimately ſuſpended upon, and reſolved into Works; for Faith it ſelf is linked to *Moral Serioufneſs*, as the condition thereof, and conſequently all the Promiſes that ſuppoſe Faith as their Condition. *Laſtly*, I would know, to what Covenant he'll reduce the Promiſe of Converſion, upon being *morally Serious*? To reduce it to the Covenant of Works, is plainly groſs; and if he reduce it to the Covenant of Grace, then that Covenant hath two Conditions, *viz*. Faith and *Moral Serioufneſs*, as the Condition of Faith, which I would think is ſtrange Doctrine indeed.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Concerning the Soul of Man, as it comes out of GOD's Creating Hand.

MR. *Webſter*'s Charge againſt him is, That he finds Fault with the Reformed Divines, for ſaying, That the Soul coming out of the Creating Hands of GOD, is deprived of Original Righteouſneſs; and he thinks, That depriving the Soul thereof, is inconſiſtent with GOD's Juſtice and Goodneſs, becauſe our Souls never committed any thing that deſerved ſuch a Sentence: But ſays, That the Soul is created, as pure and holy as *Adam*'s was.

TO which he Anſwers, *That his Opinion is not very diſtinctly nor fully repreſented by Mr.* Webſter; but if this be not the very ſame as to the Subſtance with what Mr. *Simſon* immediately delivers as his own Judgment, any indifferent Perſon may judge.

PAG. 225. His own Judgment upon this head he delivers as follows, And, 1ſt. *He thinks theſe Divines are in the wrong who ſay, That GOD acts the part of a Judge, when he Creats the Souls that are to be united to the Bodies, pro-created by* Adam *and his Poſterity, without Original Righteouſneſs, which he calls a Metaphyſical Fancy, that is founded neither upon Scripture nor Reaſon.* And ſays further, *That it is inconſiſtent either with the Juſtice, and Goodneſs of GOD, to create a rational Creature without any Diſpoſitions to Good, much more to create it with Inclinations to Evil.* And further ſays, *That the Divines who maintain this Opinion, contend againſt*

Pelagians

Pelagians, Papiſts *and* Arminians, *that there is no middle State between theſe two, being inclined to Good, or inclined to Evil, &c.*

Now, 1*ſt*. Any Body may obſerve, That there is no material difference here from what is charged in the Libel. 2*dly*. He plainly owns, That he condemns the Orthodox Divines as in an Error on this Head, as *Markius*, *Turrettin* and others; ſo that he has none to ſtand by him here, but the Adverſaries of the Truth, ſuch as *Arminians*, *&c.* which looks not ſo well. 3*dly*. *He calls GOD's being conſidered as a Judge in the Creating of the Soul without Original Righteouſneſs, a Metaphyſical Fancy.* This looks like the Dialect of *Arminians*, who call material Points of Religion Metaphyſical Things, not needful to be determined. 4*thly*. Whether this be founded upon Scripture and Reaſon, we ſhall have occaſion within a little to conſider; I wiſh he may produce Scripture Grounds, proving the Souls of *Adam*'s Poſterity to be created, as pure as *Adam*'s was before he fell; ſince this is a point of ſome Moment. 5*thly*. If it be inconſiſtent with GOD's Juſtice and Goodneſs, to create the Soul now without Original Righteouſneſs, does it not ſeem as inconſiſtent with the ſame Juſtice and Goodneſs, to frame the Body of ſuch a Make, as that the Soul upon its Union with it, is infallibly corrupted by it; he, it ſeems, inclines to a midle ſtate of *in puris Naturalibus*, without either Grace or Sin, and its known who maintain this, and for what End. I ſuppoſe he will hardly find one Orthodox Divine with him on this Head; he owns that the Souls of Infants are created as pure as *Adam*'s was, ſo that excepting

theſe

these Habits *Adam* received, as being in an Adult State, *Adam* was created *in puris Naturalibus*, and these Habits seem to have been Adventitious to his State.

2. HE says also, he Maintains, *That GOD cannot act the part of a Judge in the very act of Creation, and in Creating, punish it either for any Sin of its own, (which it could not possibly be guilty of) or for* Adam's *Sin, which cannot be imputed to it till it be once Created and United to the Body; because till then it is not of* Adam's *Posterity.*

3. HE says, *He sees no need of its being by GOD deprived of Original Righteousness, seing the Influence that such a Body to which it is united, must needs have upon it, is abundantly effectual to deprive it thereof;* and says, *He finds nothing in Scripture to determine this Metaphysical debate on either side.*

4: HE thinks, *That the Souls of Infants since the Fall, as they come from the Hands of their Creator, are as pure and holy as the Souls of Infants would have been created, supposing* Adam *had not fallen, And that they are created as pure and holy as* Adam *was created, except as to these Qualifications and Habits, which he received as being created in an Adult State, which Infants of his Race had wanted, supposing he had not fallen.*

To thir Things we offer these Considerations, *First*, All Orthodox Divines affirm, That GOD acts the Part of a Judge, in creating the Soul, for then the Soul is considered, as it was Represented in *Adam*, and sinned in him, as a Federal Head. *2dly.* GOD's making a Man, is terminated upon the whole Person, made up of Soul and Body; so that the Soul exists not, before it's

Union

Union with the Body; but in the very Minut
of it's Creation, it is united to the Body
3*dly*. If it be not inconsistent with the Goodness o
God, to create the Body with such corrupt Disposi
tions, as infects the Soul, upon it's Union therewith
neither is it inconsistent to create the Soul withou
Original Righteousness; for what hath the Bod
done, before it's Existence, more than the Sou
4*thly*. If it be inconsistent with Divine Goodnes
to create a Rational Creature without som
Dispositions to Good, as he himself affirms, pag
215. *Then Man, as made up of Soul and Body, (be
ing a Rational Creature) is not born without som
Dispositions to Good*; Which, how it agrees wit
Gen: 6. 5. and with the Doctrine of Original sin
any may judge. 5*thly*. His Reason is, becaus
creating without Original Righteousness being
Punishment, supposes the Imputation of *Adam*
sin, which cannot be imputed to the Soul, till
be one of *Adam*'s Posterity, which it is not t
united to the Body: Now, 1*st*. It seems, Tha
he founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s sin upo
Natural Generation; For, he says, *The Sin is n
imputed till the Soul be one of* Adam's *Posterity*, whic
it is not till united to the Body. 2*dly*. Th
Reason will prove, That the Body cannot b
punished for *Adam*'s sin, (*i. e.* made with suc
Dispositions as infect the Soul) till once it b
formed and united to the Soul; for according t
his own Way of Reasoning, till then, it is not
Adam's Posterity. 3*dly*. Do not all Divines hol
a virtual and Legal Imputation of Adam's *sin
his Posterity, immediately upon his sinning*; for
they were some Way existing as Represented
hi

im, then his ſin was imputed to them, as thus preſented in *Adam*; And this is the Reaſon f their being created, or made without Origi- l Righteouſneſs; for they are conſidered as aving ſinned in *Adam*, as their Federal Head, nd ſo as guilty, and in Conſe quence of this are reated, or made without Original Righteouſ- els. 4*thly*. Is not Man from the very firſt Mo- ent of his Being, made mortal? Now if his eaſoning hold, That Man muſt exiſt in an uni- ed State of Body and Soul, e're *Adam*'s ſin can e imputed to him, then he muſt exiſt, e're ever e be Mortal; for Mortality is the Effect of the mputation of *Adam*'s ſin; and being a Puniſh- ent, plainly ſuppoſes it; ſo that if the Soul and ody muſt exiſt united, e're *Adam*'s ſin be im- uted to the Man, much more muſt the Soul and ody exiſt united, e're the Man be Mortal: Mortality ſuppoſing the Imputation of ſin. From hich it is plain, that he denies the Imputation f *Adam*'s ſin, in the Senſe of all Orthodox Di- ines. 5*thly*. His ſaying, *That* Adam's *ſin cannot e imputed to us, till once we exiſt*, is contrar to he Scripture, *Rom*: 5. 12. where we are all ſaid o have ſinned with Reference to *Adam*'s ſin, nd *Verſe* 19. of the ſame *Chapter*, and to the *Catechiſms Larger and Shorter*, where we are ſaid o have *ſinned in* Adam, *and to have fallen with im*. Now if we ſinned in *Adam*, when he fell, is ſin was certainly then imputed to us, *viz.* Virtually and Legally before we exiſted Per- onally; for which Imputation our exiſting in *Adam* as our Federal Head, was a ſufficient Ground: Nor is a particular and Perſonal Im-

putation of *Adam*'s ſin to every Man, upon his Exiſtence needful; becauſe when *Adam* was condemned, all his Poſterity were condemned in him, and becauſe the Coveyance of the Bleſſings or Curſes of the Covenant of Works, as *Adam* obeyed or brake, was to be by Natural Generation.

HE ſays, *That the Influence the Body hath upon the Soul, is ſufficient to deprive it of Original Righteouſneſs, upon it's Union therewith*; Now this I cannot well underſtand: For 1*ſt*. He plainly ſuppoſes the Body is formed, Morally corrupt; but the Body (as all hold) is not a formal Subject, nor can be, of ſin; becauſe all ſin is formally ſeated in the Soul, according to *Mat* 15. 19. *Out of the Heart proceeds evil Thoughts, &c.* The Body is only the Tool, or Inſtrument, for Executing ſinful Luſts. 2*dly*. The Body at the ſuppoſeſt, is only created with Seeds of Diſeaſes, if he derive the Infection of the Soul, from this Temper of the Body, to which it is united; he confeſs it is a new Way, and falls in with the *Arminian* Scheme (for ſo *Limburgh* explains *Pſal.* 51. 5.) but this deſtroys the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, as is plain. 3*dly*. GOD's Act in making Man, as alſo, Natural Generation, terminates upon the whole Perſon, as all Orthodox Divines hold, ſo that a Man begets not a Body, but a Man like himſelf. 4*thly*. It ſeems, according to Mr. *Simſon*, that the firſt Effect of *Adam*'s ſin, upon the Soul, is its Infection by its Union with the Body: Now I would know when *Adam*'s ſin is imputed, it muſt either be before the Soul's Infection; if ſo, why does he not ſay

ay ſo much? Beſides, that a Man exiſting as one of *Adam*'s Poſterity, does not therefore make him guilty of his ſin, unleſs we found the Imputation of that ſin upon Natural Generation, or the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin follows the Soul's infection; But this deſtroys the Natural Order of the Imputation of ſin, being the Foundation of the Corruption of our Nature, and is contrar to the *Catechiſms*, which, in deſcribing the ſinfulneſs of our State, puts *the Guilt of Adam's ſin*; before the *want of Original Righteouſneſs*, &c. *Laſtly*, If there be nothing in Scripture to determine this Queſtion, on either Side, it is ſtrange he is ſo Dogmatick and poſitive in his Opinion.

AGAIN, he ſays, *That the Souls of Infants are created Pure, and Holy, &c.* But 1*ſt*. If this cannot be proven from Scripture, as he himſelf owns, how comes he to aſſert it; it being a Point of Faith, and a Right Notion of the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin, having a Connection with it? 2*dly*. If the Soul, be firſt created Pure and Holy, then it muſt exiſt ſome Time, tho' never ſo ſmall, before it's Union with the Body, and if ſo, then it's eaſie to ſlide into that Opinion, that the Souls of all Men were created at the beginning; for if once we maintain the Soul's Exiſtence before its Union with the Body, there is nothing to determine how long it might have exiſted before. 3*dly*. If GOD be only conſidered as a Creator, in giving the Soul a Being, why not alſo in the forming of the Body; for the Body is not of *Adam*'s Poſterity, till it once exiſt united to the Soul, more than the Soul is, till it be united to the Body. Therefore the Body muſt

alſo be created without Seeds of Mortality, as well as the Soul without ſin, and ſo a ſinleſs Soul, is united to a Body without Seeds of Mortality, and Diſeaſes; and then Men exiſt as pure both as to Soul and Body, before the Imputation of *Adam*'s ſin to him, as Infants would have been, if *Adam* had not ſinned. 4*thly*. It's but a dull Way to derive the firſt Infection of the Soul from its Union with the Body; for how can the Body, that is not the Subject of ſin, infect the Soul. 5*thly*. According to his Way of Reaſoning, the Soul is not of *Adam*'s Poſterity till it be united to the Body; Therefore the whole Man muſt alſo exiſt before ſin can be imputed to him, and conſequently all the Effects of this Imputation, and ſo the Mortality of the Body muſt be Poſterior to the Union of the Soul and Body. 6*thly*. If it be inconſiſtent with GOD's Juſtice and Goodneſs, to create the Soul without Original Righteouſneſs, having never committed any ſin to deſerve it; is it not alſo contrar to the ſame Juſtice and Goodneſs, to unite it to a corrupt Body, by which Union it will be infallibly infected with ſin: For it never did any Thing to deſerve ſuch an infecting Union, more than it did to procure its being created without Original Righteouſneſs. 7*thly*. This Union of the Soul with ſuch a Body, upon which its Pollution inevitably follows, muſt needs be a Puniſhment; and ſo the Soul muſt be conſidered when it's unite to the Body, as ſome Way guilty and having ſinned in *Adam*: And if ſo, why may not the Soul in its Creation be conſidered as guilty in *Adam*, and ſo be created without

Ori

Original Righteouſneſs. There is the ſame Force of Reaſon on every Hand. 8*thly*. He ſays, *The Souls of Infants are as Pure and Holy, as* Adam's *Soul, excepting the Qualifications and Habits he received, as being created in an Adult State, &c.* From which it's plain, That according to him, Infants, if *Adam* had ſtood, had been created in a State of ſimple Innocency, that is a middle State, betwixt ſin and Holineſs, or *in Puris Naturalibus*: Such as *Socinians* ſay *Adam* was created, *viz.* In a State of pure Innocency; yet without the Habits of Holineſs, ſo that according to Mr. *Simſon*, the Habits of Holineſs would have been intirely acquired as to *Adam*'s Poſterity, which is clear from his own Words, *Page* 225. where he ſays, *That the Divines who maintain this Opinion, that the Soul is created without Original Righteouſneſs, againſt* Pelagians *and* Arminians, *ſay, there cannot be a middle State betwixt being inclined to Good, and inclined to Evil.* So that it's plain he is for a middle State.

HE anſwers *Pag.* 227. *Two Scriptures, viz.* Rom: 5. 12. *Which*, he ſays, *are not contrar to what he maintains, ſince he owns, that the Soul cannot become ſinful, till by Union with the Body, it become one of* Adam's *Poſterity, and then it is polluted, and liable to Death.* 2*dly*. He ſays, *He cannot reconcile with this Text Mr.* Webſter's *Opinion, That the Soul becomes a Sinner before it be in* Adam, *and that by an Act of GOD's Sovereignity, exerciſed in it's Creation, and not by Reaſon of its being in* Adam; *for ſo all have not ſinned in* Adam, *but before they were in him.*

BUT, 1*ſt*. This Anſwer is but a confident aſſerting of his own Opinion, and ſhifting the Force

of

of the Text. 2*dly*. The Text plainly ſays, *That all Mankind have ſinned, and that by* Adam's *Diſobedience, they were made, conſtitute or ſiſted Sinners, Rom:* 5: 19: Now all Mankind were not exiſting, when *Paul* wrote this, far leſs when *Adam* ſinned; therefore they ſinned before they exiſted perſonally; ſo that when they were pronounced Sinners, they were conſidered as exiſting in *Adam*, as their Federal Head: Wherefore when Men are now made, they are conſidered as having ſinned in *Adam*; for GOD's Act of making Men now terminates upon the whole Perſon, as all ſound Divines own. 2*dly*. The Soul does not become a Sinner before it be in *Adam*; but when the Soul is created, or rather the whole Man made, the Man is conſidered, as having ſinned in *Adam* his Federal Head, and ſo is made without Original Righteouſneſs. 3*dly*. The Soul never exiſts, till the Moment of its Union with the Body, as all ſound Divines hold. 4*thly*. It ſeems Mr. *Simſon* allows of no other Way of our being in *Adam*, than by our actual exiſting as his natural Deſcendants, which is groſs enough. 5*thly*. When GOD creates the Soul, or rather makes the whole Man without Original Righteouſneſs: It is not an Act of Sovereignity, but of Juſtice; becauſe Men are then conſidered as having ſinned in *Adam* as their Federal Head, as is plain. 6*thly*. The polluting of the Soul, by its Union with the Body, is an odd and ſtrange Way of explaining, how the Soul is infected, and would tempt one to think, That there is more under this than he expreſſeth; for he ſpeaks not a Word of the Imputation of

Adam's

Adam's firſt Sin, which is the formal Ground, whence our Natures are corrupted.

2. HE ſays, *The ſame Anſwer ſerves the ſecond Text:* And further, he ſays, *That according to Mr.* Webſter's *Opinion* (which is the Opinion of all Orthodox Divines) *the Text muſt be read thus,* 1 Cor: 15. 21. *For ſince by GOD* (*but not by Man*) *came Death,* viz: *of Sin and Puniſhment; and accordingly,* Ver: 22. *For as in GOD* (*but not in* Adam) *all die,* viz: *in Sin, and are liable to the Puniſhment of Death for it.*

BUT he ſeems here to be miſtaken; for *Paul* ſpeaks of the meritorious or procuring Cauſe of Death, on the one Hand, *viz. Adam,* as Chriſt is the meritorious Cauſe of Life, on the other Hand; and therefore, it's Nonſenſe to ſay, That in GOD all die or ſin; becauſe he is not the meritorious Cauſe of Sin and Death, of which Kind of Cauſe *Paul* here only ſpeaks: GOD is conſidered, when he makes Men without Original Holineſs, as a Judge inflicting the Sentence, therefore they cannot be ſaid to die, or ſin in Him.

HE denies, *His Opinion to be contrary to the* Larger *and* Shorter Catechiſms; *becauſe we muſt be humane Perſons,* i. e. *have Souls and Bodies united, e're we can be of* Adam's *Race, and ſo have Sin imputed to us: But as ſoon as we are of* Adam's *Race, it is imputed to us, and we thereby brought into a State of Sin and Miſery.* But 1*ſt.* His Reaſon contradicts the *Catechiſms*; for we are ſaid to have ſinned and fallen in him; and therefore his Sin is ſome Way imputed, before we exiſt perſonally. 2*dly.* In the Deſcription of Man's ſinful State, the

the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin goes before the Want of Original Righteouſneſs; therefore the Corruption of the Soul is not the Effect of its Union with the Body. 3*dly*. If Soul and Body be united e're Sin be imputed, then both the Soul is without Corruption, and the Body without the Seeds of Mortality, at their firſt Union: For he himſelf ſays, *That they muſt be*, 1ſt. *Of* Adam's *Poſterity. And then*, 2dly. *That his Sin is imputed to them. And then*, 3dly. *That they are thereby brought into a State of Sin and Miſery*. So that the Corruption of the Soul is the Effect of the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, not of its Union with the Body.

LASTLY, He alledges *Chamier* to be for him, in his *Panſtrat: Cathol: Tom*: 3. *Cap*: 7. *Parag*: 12. We anſwer, That indeed in that Place *Chamier* ſays, *The Soul is corrupted in its Union with the Body*: But he does not ſay, That the Soul is firſt created pure, and then corrupted by the Body, as is plain from the Words themſelves, which we ſhall ſet down, *Cum igitur tum Temporis Anima a Creatione pura* (*non minus quam quæ creantur in Utero*) *conſenſerit Corpori, atque ita fuerit corrupta: Quod mirum, ſi et quæ in Utero creantur, ipſæ ſponte conſentientes corpori corrupto, corrumpantur etiam, &c.* Where it's plain, 1*ſt*. That theſe Words (*non minus quam quæ creantur in Utero*) do not refer to the former Words, but to the following, *viz. conſenſerit Corpori*, that is, conſented to the Body. 2*dly*. He there imputes the Corruption of the Souls, created in the Belly, to their own Act of conſenting to a corrupt Body, even as he ſays, *Adam*'s Soul was corrupted that Way, ſo that according to him the Infection of the

the Soul begins from its own Act. And further we would notice, That *Chamier* in the ſame *Par.* ſays, 1*ſt*. That the Soul exiſts not before its Union with the Body. 2*dly*. That its Corruption is as early as its Union with the Body; ſo that according to him, its Corruption is as early as the Soul's Exiſtence; and therefore the Soul is not firſt created pure. 2*dly*. According to him, the making of Man terminates upon the whole Perſon, who is conſidered as having ſinned in *Adam*, and ſo made without Original Righteouſneſs.

CHAP. IX.

Concerning the Foundation of the Neceſſity of Eternal Puniſhment.

THE Article here libelled, is, *That Profeſſor* Simſon *denies, That the Neceſſity of Eternal Puniſhment flows from Sin, as it is an Offence committed againſt an Infinite Majeſty: And again, That the Neceſſity of Eternal Puniſhment follows from Sin, its being an Offence committed againſt an Infinite Majeſty: But ſays, This does not make it neceſſary.*

NOW in Anſwer to this Charge, he ſays, *That it is falſe, that ever he taught any ſuch thing; or, denied, That Eternal Puniſhment neceſſarly flows from Sin, on Acconnt of its offending an Infinite Majeſty.*

NEXT he tells us what he teaches, 1*ſt*. *That this is not the only Reaſon of the Eternity of the Puniſhment*. 2*dly*. He adds two more Reaſons of this, which he gives us in a Concluſion of his, that he ſays, *He proves* (*which*, he tells us, *he has in a Manuſcript beſide him*) *viz. Unde liquet Pœnarum Æternitatem eſſe neceſſariam, non*

non tantum quia contra Majestatem infinite excelsam delinquitur; verum etiam quia minimum Peccatum, æternam Legislatori, Subditisque Injuriam infert, atque præterea æterna Pœna Legis Sanctionem necessario constituit.

HE denies this Article to be his, and *Pag:* 230. challanges Mr. *Webster* to prove his Allegation on this head; And therefore says, *That he is not concerned, altho' this Opinion were contrary to the Questions of our* Catechisms, *and the* Scriptures *mentioned by him*: Yet he thinks, *That Mr.* Webster, *by all his Skill, will not be able to prove, That it is contrary either to these Questions, or Scriptures; Seing it may be agreeable to the Justice and Power of GOD, in His Law, to threaten eternal Punishment, for holy and just Ends, altho' it were true that it did not flow from the infinit Excellency of His Majesty. For supposing, That GOD by a free and arbitrary Act of his Will, had threatned eternal Punishment for every Sin? even the least, in this case every Sin would deserve GOD's Wrath and Curse, both in this Life and that which is to come.* For says he, *Sin always deserves the Punishment threatned in GOD's Law, which is the Rule and Measure of what Sin deserves.* And so he affirms, *That what is said in the Questions and Scriptures mentioned, is not contradicted by these, who do maintain the Proposition libelled, upon Supposition they grant, That GOD hath threatned eternal Punishment to every Sin.*

BUT, 1*st*. I conceive, That Mr. *Simson* delivers not his Judgment so distinctly upon this Head as were to be wished. 2*dly*. If the Proposition libelled be not his Opinion, why does he vindicate it? 3*dly*. If it be not contrary to these Questions of the *Catechisms* and these *Scriptures* cited

cited in the Libel, what should hinder it from being his Opinion? *4thly.* He affirms, That it would not be contrary to GOD's Justice, to threaten eternal Punishment to every Sin, altho' it were true, That it did not necessarly follow from the infinit Excellency of His Majesty. It seems then according to him, That altho' every Sin did not deserve eternal Punishment, yet GOD could justly threaten it, and consequently inflict the same. So that GOD could justly inflict a greater Punishment, than Sin considered in it self deserves; which how consistent with the Justice of GOD, I cannot so well conceive. Sure it seems plainly contrary to *Job.* 34. 23. Where it is said, *That he will not put upon Man more than right, that he should enter into Judgment with GOD.* *5thly.* He plainly makes the threatning the Rule and Measure of what Sin deserves, but this seems to be dangerous, and to contain more under it than he expresses. This is certainly contrary to the Analogy of Faith and sound Reason. For I ever thought, Sin's deserving Punishment had been founded in the intrinsick Nature of it, as it is the Violation of the Authority of an infinitely holy GOD; indeed the actual Obligation to Punishment is founded upon the Threatning which takes place natively upon the Violation of the preceptive Part of the Law, because of GOD's Holiness and Essential Justice. *6thly.* It seems according to him, if it were not for the threatning, Sin would not deserve Punishment. For according to him, the threatning is the Rule and Measure of what Sin deserves; and therefore Sin's being against an Infinite Majesty, is no Reason of its deserving Punishment; seing according

to

him, the threatning is the Rule and Measure of this; and yet Sin's being against an Infinite Majesty, in the Conclusion of his before cited, is one Reason why Sin deserves eternal Punishment. *7thly.* It seems according to him a Question, whether GOD hath threatned eternal Punishment to every least Sin of natural Men, by the Tenor of the first Covenant; and so according to him it is questionable, if there be not venial Sin in the Popish Sense, *i. e.* that deserve not eternal Punishment; for according to him, the Threatning is the Measure of what Sin deserves, and he makes a doubt of it, whether GOD hath threatned eternal Punishment for every Sin. For says he, *Pag.* 130. *Supposing that GOD by a Free and Arbitrary Act of his Will, had threatned eternal Punishment to every Sin, &c.* Indeed the least Sins, even of Believers, deserve eternal Punishment, but yet that is not threatned to them, because CHRIST's Satisfaction is applied to them upon their believing. *8thly.* We are to distinguish betwixt what Sin in its intrinsick Nature deserves, which is founded upon the Transgression of the preceptive Part of the Law, and the Sinner's actual Obligation to Punishment, which is founded upon the threatning, so that Mr. *Simson* confounds the Demerit of Sin, and the Sinner's actual Obligation to Punishment. *9thly.* According to this Doctrine, the sins of Believers do not deserve eternal Punishment; Because according to him, the threatning is the Measure of what Sin deserves. Now it seems plain, Wrath is not threatned to the Sins of Believers, as appears from *Psal:* 89. 30. and downwards, *If his Children break my Law, &c.* And yet it is certain,

tain, that their Sins deſerve eternal Wrath. 10*thly*. Whether Doctor *Tillotſon*'s Opinion and his agree, I ſhall not determine. *Tillotſon* ſays, That GOD may Threaten greater Puniſhment than ſin deſerves. Mr. *Simſon* affirms, *That it is an Arbitrary act of GOD's Will to threaten eternal Puniſhment to every ſin, even the leaſt;* how like to others theſe appear, any may judge. 11*thly*. As to Mr. *Rutherford*, he indeed derives the actual Obligation to Puniſhment from the threatning (for I know that he denies *Juſtitia Vindicatrix to be eſſential to GOD*) but he no way denies, that every Sin, abſtract from the threatning, deſerves eternal Puniſhment; Only ſays, That notwithſtanding of the threatning, Puniſhment neceſſarly follows, as is plain to any, that will read the place cited by Mr. *Simſon*. 12*thly*. Since Mr. *Simſon* maintains *Juſtitia Vindicatrix* to be eſſential to GOD. I wonder how he ſays, That the contrary Opinion founding the Demerit of Sin, in the arbitrary threatning of Puniſhment, is not contrary to Scripture; For if it be arbitrary to GOD, to threaten eternal Puniſhment to every Sin or not, as he ſees fit; one from this would be tempted to think, that punitive Juſtice is not ſo Eſſential to GOD, for then he might threaten the greateſt Sins with leſs Puniſhment than Eternal. 13*thly*. That this Opinion is contrary to the Queſtion in the *Shorter Catechiſm*, *What doth every Sin deſerve?* Is plain, for there it is ſaid, *every Sin deſerves, GOD's Wrath and Curſe, both in this Life and that which is to come.* Where we ſee the Puniſhment is founded upon the intrinſick evil or demerit of Sin: unleſs we will confound the intrinſick Merit of Sin, with a Sinner's actual Obligati-

on to Puniſhment, Now all Divines derive the deſerving of Sin, from its intrinſick evil Nature, and found the Juſtice of the Sanction upon the Hainouſneſs of Sin, as a Violation of the Preceptive part of the Law. The ſame alſo is clear from the anſwer to the Queſtion of the *Larger Catechiſm*, viz. *What Miſery did the Fall bring upon Mankind?* Where it is ſaid, *That he is juſtly by Sin liable to all Puniſhments, &c.* Whence it's clear, That his liableneſs to Puniſhment by a threatning, is founded upon the juſtice of the thing, *viz.* the intrinſick evil and demerit of Sin; And conſequently is not founded ultimately and only upon the threatning. For I would know, why GOD threatens Puniſhment to Sin? It muſt either be a thing intirely Arbitrary, If ſo, then GOD might threaten no Puniſhment to Sin at all, and ſo punitive Juſtice would not be Eſſential to GOD. Or it muſt be, becauſe Sin deſerves it, and Juſtice requires it; if ſo, the Demerit of Sin is not founded upon the threatning, but ſuppoſed to it, and ſo the threatning is not the Meaſure of what Sin deſerves. 14*thly.* As to the Scriptures adduced by Mr. *Webſter*, *viz. Gen.* 2. 17. *Rom:* 6. 23. *Matt:* 25. 40, 46. *Jud.* 7. which Profeſſor *Simſon* denies to be contradicted by the Article libelled, ſince he only affirms it, we ſhall paſs them alſo. Only we would take notice of *Rom:* 6. 23. Where *Death is ſaid to be the Wages of Sin.* There it's plain, That Sin's deſerving Puniſhment, is founded principally upon the evil Nature of Sin, as it is a Rebellion againſt GOD: For Wages or Pay is due to Soldiers not only by Promiſe, but alſo from the natural Equity of the Thing. Now if the

Puniſh-

Puniſhment be intirely founded upon the Sanction, which Mr. *Simſon* makes the Meaſure and Rule of what Sin deſerves, it will follow alſo, that eternal Life is the Wages of Faith: For Man's Right to Life is not founded upon the deſerving of Faith, but upon the free Promiſe. There is the ſame Reaſon for both, unleſs we found the Puniſhment of Sin upon its evil and intrinſick Nature.

How relevant this Article is, any may obſerve, who ſhall judge of the whole Scheme of his Doctrine; and indeed it's agreeable enough to his Doctrine, *concerning the Covenant of Works*, where he founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin to us, *Not upon our tranſgreſſing the preceptive Part of the Law, in* Adam, *as our publick federal Head; but in the Extent of the Sanction*: As alſo it is of a Piece with *Man's own Happineſs being his ultimate and laſt End, in ſerving and glorifying GOD here;* to ſay, That the chief and great Motive to keep Men back from Sin, is the Threatning, and Fear of Hell and Puniſhment, which is the very ſame, with Man's own Happineſs being his ultimate End, to which his glorifying of GOD ſtands ſubordinate.

I conclude this Chapter, by noticing another Scripture, *viz. Matth:* 25. 41, 42. *Depart from me ye curſed,* &c. *For I was an hungred, and ye fed me not, &c.* Where it is plain, That their being adjudged to Puniſhment, is founded not ſo much upon the Threatning, as upon their not obeying the Command. As alſo from 2 *Theſ:* 1. 6. *Seing it is a righteous thing, with GOD to render Tribulation to them that trouble you:* Where it's plain, That the Puniſhment of Sin, is founded chiefly

chiefly upon the Natural Equity of the Thing; and so upon the intrinsick evil Nature of Sin, as it's a Disobedience to GOD's Command. As also it is further evident, from *Rom:* 5. 18. *By the Offence of one Judgment, came upon all Men to Condemnation*: There it's evident, That the Punishment of Sin is founded not upon the Threatning, but upon Sin's being an Offence, I might add more Scriptures; but I forbear, that I may not be too prolix.

CHAP. X.

Concerning sinning in Hell.

THE Article libelled, *P:* 232. is, *That after the last Judgment, there will be no sinning in Hell? And that the Damned shall be made to acquiesce in, and acknowledge the Justice of GOD in punishing them.*

To this he answers, *That these Words* (they shall be made to acquiesce, *&c.*) *are not his Way of speaking, and that he remembers not, that ever he expressed his Mind in these Terms.* But says, *If the Meaning be, that they are under a clear and full Conviction of the Justice of the Sentence, that it leaves no Room, to doubt of its Equity: And that they are, by the Power of GOD, restrained from the least repining Thought against it:* He grants this to be his Opinion; but thinks, *This is not fitly expresst by the Word* (Acquiesce) *which ordinarly signifies* quiet Satisfaction, and Peace of Mind in any thing, *which Sense is inconsistent with the State of the damned.* In like manner, he says, *If nothing be meant by ac-*

knowr-

knowledging the Justice of GOD, but the foresaid Conviction, and not repining, he owns it to be his Opinion; but if it be understood of an active Acknowledgement thereof in Hell, he says, *it agrees not with his Opinion.*

BUT, 1*st*. Whether he remember of his using these Words, *That the Damned shall be made to acquiesce in the Punishment*. I cannot tell: But yet severals, who were with Mr. *Simson* in *Kello*'s House, are pretty positive of his using these Words, tho' perhaps they could not swear *ipsissima Verba*, according to the new Rule to be observed, in taking Depositions. 2*dly*. To say, They are restrained from repining, is to affirm, They carry better under GOD's Wrath in Hell, than Believers do here under GOD's fatherly Rebukes, who are not kept altogether free from Repining: To be kept from Repining under GOD's Chastisements here, is a great Privilege; and it seems no less a privilege, yea, greater for the Reprobate, under the full Deluges of Wrath, to be kept absolutely from Repining: If he say, they are meerly passive in this; this is to confess a violent chaining up of the natural Actings of the Powers of the Soul, under Extremity of Sufferings, which is a Miracle, continued through Eternity, far more than the restraining of the Fire for a Time, from burning the three Children. I conceive it is but a dull Opinion, to say, That the natural Actings of the Powers of the Souls of the Damned, suitable to what the Extremity of their Sufferings hath a strong Influence to draw out, are eternally chained up: But more of this afterwards.

2. He says, *That he thinks there will be no sinning*

in Hell, after the last Judgment, not because the Damned then have their Natures renewed, or voluntarly abstain from Sin: But because then they will by the Power of GOD, be put in a State purely passive, being plunged in the lowest Abyss of suffering; and because in that State they will have no more the Exercise of their Rational Faculties than will be necessary: 1st. To make them duly sensible of the tormenting Flames of Divine Vengeance. 2dly. To make them perceive with the outmost Perplexity, Horror and Amazement, the Train of their wicked Actions and corrupt Inclinations, while on Earth, that GOD sets in Order before them. 3dly. To cause them to entertain clear and silencing Convictions of the Equity of GOD's Sentence.

THIS Exercise of the Rational Faculties, he says, *Pag.* 234. *He sometimes calls* Action, *only that he may distinguish the passive State of the damned, from the passive State of Stocks and Stones; and so,* he says, *he uses the Word* Action, *in a large Sense, as it signifies any Perception agreeable to a Rational Creature: But if* Action *be taken more strictly, for what a Person does freely, willingly and of Choice; then,* he says, *such Actions are inconsistent with the passive State of the Damned, which leaves no Room for voluntary Determination of the Mind, nor allows of the least wandring Thought from what they are unalterably fixed unto, by the avenging Powe of GOD.* He says also, *That the three Particulars above mntioned, comprehend, at least, the principal Part of their Eternal Misery: The first of which,* he says, *may be called passive Sensations, to distinguish them from these, which Men desire and chuse, while on Earth: The second,* he says, *may be called passive Reflection; because this is common to them, with Peoples Reflections while on Earth, that them-*

emſelves and their Actions are the tormenting Objects their Thoughts; becauſe they are by the Power of OD, laid under an abſolute Neceſſity of this perplex- Sight of their wicked Actions. He does not tell what the third is like.

AND from this Account of the State of the amned, he thinks it evident, *That they are not pable of doing either Good or Evil, or of the leaſt ought or Motion, that is materially Evil, or con- ary to the Eternal Law of Nature; although their ature remain, as corrupt as ever.* Further he ſays, *hat as this State renders them incapable of being un- r the preceptive Part of the Law, ſo GOD in his finite Wiſdom and Power, keeps them in perfect Sub- ction, and moral Dependence, ſuitable to their State, inflicting the Puniſhment threatned,* &c.

AND this he ſays, *agrees exactly with the account ven us in Scripture of the State of the Damned, where e are told, That they ſhall ſtand Speechleſs, be bound and and Foot, caſt into utter Darkneſs, and into the ake that burns with Fire and Brimſtone, where their orm dies not, and their Fire is not quenched, where ere is weeping and wailing and gnaſhing of Teeth.* Where he ſays, *we have not the leaſt hint of their ſing from Choice, much leſs of Liberty to commit Sin; ut on the contrary, a plain Repreſentation of ſilencing onvictions of cloſs and powerful Reſtraint, of renting houghts of their own Sin and Folly, and of the moſt rendful and exquiſite Torments diſcovering themſelves their proper Signs, as Gnaſhing of Teeth,* &c.

TO which he adds, *Pag:* 236. *That un- ſs the Puniſhment of the Damned reſtrain them om ſinning, GOD could not thereby be glori- ed; for the only thing that diſhonours GOD is*

Sin, and the only way to repair his Honour, is to inflict due Punishment for it, but if the Damned in Hell do still Sin through Eternity, and that more Heinously than they do in Time, as some would have it: Then it is impossible for GOD to repair His Honour, by inflicting of due Punishment for these sins, that are eternally increasing, because Finite Creatures are not capable of such Punishments; And the threatning of eternal Wrath for every Sin could not possibly be execute, if Sins increased Eternally: And so upon this Supposition, condemning of sinners to eternal Punishment, and executing this Sentence in stead of repairing the Honour of GOD injured by sin, would be the most effectual Method to perpetuate His Dishonour beyond Possibility of Redress.

THIS is the Substance of what he advances for his Opinion, and must be in the next place considered. *1st.* He owns, That the corrupt Nature of the Damned, remains still with them in Hell; But if it be still a morally corrupt Nature in Hell, there must certainly be a Disconformity in them to the Law; for the Law requires Holiness in Nature, as well as in Actions, and therefore they are still under the preceptive Part of the Law: And if so, it is strange they should be under the preceptive Part of the Law, as to their Nature, and not as to their Actions; but if they be not at all under the preceptive Part of the Law, then their corrupt Nature ceases to be such in Hell; For where there is no Law, there is no Transgression of the Law: But he himself affirms, That their corrupt Natures continue in Hell. *2dly.* It is strange, That their Natures should continue corrupt in Hell, and yet they never commit actual Sin, even when under the greatest Torments. For I would know,

whether

whether it be their ſin in Hell, that they have corrupt Natures? If it be not, their Natures ceaſe to be corrupt in Hell: If it be, then their having of Sanctified Natures is their Duty; And if ſo, may it not ſeem a little ſtrange, that the Damned ſhould be obliged to Conformity in their Natures, and not in their Actions: Beſides, that this is plainly a ſin of Omiſſion. 3*dly*. He ſays, That in that State, they are purely paſſive, this ſeems ſtrange; For if ſo, then, 1*ſt*. They have no Exerciſe of their free Will: But it is a Queſtion, whether the Exerciſe of the free Will, can be altogether chained up, without the Deſtruction of the Power it ſelf; for it is hard to conceive a Spirit to be without Thinking. 2*dly*. Have the Damned no actings of the Will and Affections? To ſay they have none, is contrary to the Nature of the Soul, as a Spirit, and alſo to the Scriptures; For do not the Damned reflect, *Luk:* 16. *Where* Abraham *bids* Dives *Remember*, which ſhews it was his Duty to reflect. Now is not reflecting and conſidering former ways, a very eminent Exerciſe of the free Will. Again, have they not Deſires after ſome Mitigation of their Miſery, *Luk:* 16. *Send* Lazarus? Have they not extream Sorrow and Deſpair? And what are Deſires, Joys and Sorrows, Hope and Deſpair, but different Modifications of the Acts of the Will? 3*dly*. If they Exerciſe Acts of the free Will as Reflection, Deſire, Sorrow, Deſpair, *&c.* they are not purely paſſive, for it is impoſſible for a free Agent to be meerly paſſive in its Immediate and Immanent Actings, as ſeems very plain: For in that Caſe, either GOD muſt be the Immediate Agent and the formal Subjective Cauſe of theſe Actings,

Actings, or the Will it self; for being Acts of R
tional Powers, they must needs flow from som
formal subjective Cause, producing them: The
cannot be ascribed to GOD, for this were to ma
the great GOD to Remember, Desire, Sorrow
Despair, *&c.* and therefore the Will must needs b
the formal Agent in these Acts, and so cannot b
purely passive, which is to assert a Contradictio
It is true, there may be such powerful Impressio
made upon the Faculties from without, as infall
bly occasions such a Species of Actions, but th
no ways makes the Soul meerly passive in the pr
ducing of these Acts; For in Heaven, there a
as powerful Impressions from without, which I
fallibly occasion such unspeakable Joy and Sati
faction in the Glorified; yet in these they are n
purely passive. 4*thly*. The Reason (at least one
assigned by him, whey they are purely passive,
because they are plunged in such an Abyss of M
sery. But in Heaven, the Redeemed are sweet
swallowed up in as great an Ocean of Happine
and Felicity; And therefore according to h
Reasoning, the Redeemed must also be meer
passive in that state.

4. HE grants, They have some Exercise of the
rational Faculties in Hell, *Pag.* 233. In so far
it shall be necessary for his three Ends mentione
but it seems very absurd to allow any Exercise
the Rational Faculties, and yet say, That the Facu
ties are meerly passive in that Exercise; for that
to say, That they are both active and passive at th
same time.

5. AS to these three Branches of the Exercise
the Rational Faculties, he allows the Damned; migh

not the ſame be applied to the Glorified in Heaven, *mutatis mutandis*, viz. That ſuch have only the Exerciſe of their Rational Faculties; *Firſt*, In a Perception and Senſation of the Joys of Heaven. 2*dly*. A moſt pleaſant Reflection upon Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, as the meritorious Cauſe of their Happineſs, and perſonal Holineſs, as the Way leading to it. 3*dly*. Clear and ſatisfying Convictions of the Riches of Grace, appearing in their Salvation; for the great and exceeding Weight of Glory is, as powerful to hinder the morally right Exerciſe of their Liberty, and to make them purely paſſive, as the exceeding Weight of Miſery is, to chain up the morally evil Exerciſe of the Liberty of the Damned. 2*dly*. All theſe three are plainly vital Acts of a Principle of Life; and every vital Principle is active, and produces its own internal Acts, whatever Influence an external Cauſe may have upon the Production of theſe Acts.

6. He ſays, *That if the Exerciſe of the Rational Faculties, be called* Actions, *in that Senſe which denotes what is done by a Perſon freely, willingly and of Choice*: Then he ſays, *ſuch Actions are inconſiſtent with the paſſive State of the Damned, which leaves no Room for Choice, nor for the leaſt wandring Thought*, &c. But 1*ſt*. Such a Choice, whereby a Man can chuſe a thing, or the contrary, do or forbear, is not neceſſary to denominate Actions free; becauſe their Choice in Heaven is free; and yet, it is impoſſible they can chooſe the contrary: Devils and wicked Men chuſe Sin; but they cannot chuſe the contrary Good: It is ſufficient there be a Freedom of Choice, as to the individual Acts, tho' not as to the *Species*: If by *Choice*, he mean ſuch a Choice

as

as follws ſome Act of the Judgment, ſuch as it is, then it is free, as being a Choice made upon View of their miſerable Circumſtances, however influenced thereto, they may be by an external Cauſe. 2*dly*. Neither doth their Happineſs in Heaven allow the leaſt wandring Thought, and yet they are free; and why not here alſo? 3*dly*. Whether theſe three Particulars, mentioned by him, comprehend the principal Part of their Miſery, I ſhall not much debate; yet I would think, endleſs Separation from GOD, as conſiderable a Branch as any of theſe, which he does not mention: And if ſinning here be a Puniſhment on natural Men, as well as a Tranſgreſſion of the Law; I ſee not what ſhould hinder it to be a Puniſhment in Hell. Further I would think, That Sorrow from what they feel, Rage and Deſpair from what they ſee, muſt be their State, are no inconſiderable Branches of their Miſery; and yet theſe are no meer Paſſions, but immanent Acts of the Rational Faculties. To ſay, That GOD chains up the Rational Faculties from actual Sin, is abſurd; for if they be under no Law, a Reſtraint of their Faculties is needleſs; becauſe however ſuch exerciſe their Faculties, they never ſin, as being under no Law; and if they be under a Law, the Reſtraint upon their Faculties cannot take away their Obligation of Conformity to the Law; beſides, that the natural Actings of the Soul, ſutable to its State and Circumſtances, can never be altogether chained up, without either changing its Nature, or annihilating it: For wherever there is Knowledge and Judgment, ſome ſutable Actings of the Will muſt needs follow:

And

And all grant, That the Will can never be meerly passive in its Actings. *4thly.* As to clear and silencing Convictions, *1st* They are not meer Passions, but formal and immanent Acts of the Conscience: Why they should be meer Passions in Hell, more than upon Earth, I know not; for Clearness of Light can never make Conviction a meer Passion. *2dly.* Clear and silencing Convictions are only accidentally a Part of their Misery (for such Convictions are a Duty incumbent upon them) in Regard of the Hopelessness of their State; for abstract from that, they are a Mercy. *3dly.* I want to know, whence their being silencing, that such do not murmur, fret and repine, flows? It must either flow simply from the Clearness of the Conviction; but that is impossible, considering the Corruption of their Nature, which he owns, remains still with them, and the Extremity of their Torment, which must needs irritate their Corruption; or it must flow from GOD's chaining up their Faculties, from such and the like Operations; but this is absurd, to say, That the natural Actings of the Soul, sutable to its State and Circumstances, are for ever chained up: This is to make an eternal Miracle. Besides that all Divines acknowledge, That there are some things GOD cannot do upon Supposition, that he do another thing. As suppose, GOD make a Rational Creature, and preserve it in its Being, it must needs be under a Law, and its Liberty in general preserved: In a Word, if the Operations of the Soul be intirely chained up, I see no Need of these silencing Convictions, nor why they should be called *silencing*; since this chaining up of the

the Powers, is sufficient without them, to restrain the Damned from sinning. 4*thly*. If their not murmuring and fretting, flow not from the Clearness, and silencing Nature of their Convictions: Why calls he them silencing? Yea, they are not needful; for according to him, by the avenging Power of GOD, they are chained up from murmuring; but if they flow from the Clearness of their Convictions, then this chaining up of their Powers, is needless; besides that it is a wonderful Attainment, and the greatest Exercise of Liberty, when a Man acts according to his Light and Conviction, in not murmuring under the Punishment of Sin; yea, a wonderful morally good Exercise thereof.

HE says, *Consequently, That they are not capable of doing Good, or Evil, or of the least Thought, or Motion, that is materially evil, or contrary to the eternal Law, &c.* But, 1*st*. Is it not Mens Duty when under the Punishment of their sins, to reflect upon their sins as the procuring Cause of their Misery; as also to be convinced of the Equity of the Punishment the Law inflicts, and if it be a Duty upon wicked Men here, what hinders its being so upon them in Hell? Doth not *Abraham* desire *Dives* to remember the good Things, he enjoyed upon Earth, *Luke* 16. and that is something materially good. To say that they are meerly Passive in these Convictions, and Reflections, is unintelligible; for they are in their Nature immanent Acts of the Soul, and therefore must be ascribed to some formal subjective Agent. Now I would gladly know the formal subjective Cause of these, if it be not the Soul,

Soul, and if the Soul be the formal Agent, it is a Contradiction to ſay it is meerly Paſſive in theſe Reflections. Indeed the Circumſtances the Soul is in, may infallibly influence ſuch a Species of Actions; but that makes not the Soul Paſſive, nor ſimply chains up its Liberty, more than in Heaven, where they cannot but praiſe, and rejoice, and yet are free Agents. 2*dly*. It is inconceivable, for ſinners having corrupt Natures, to be under extream, and eternal Torments, and yet not to fret, rage, and blaſpheme. For this plainly deſtroys the Natural Actings of the Powers themſelves, or if the Powers of the Soul be eternally chained up, from acting ſuitably to their corrupt Nature, and the Circumſtances they are in, this is to eſtabliſh an eternal Miracle. 3*dly*. How their Natures ſhould remain as corrupt as ever, is hard to conceive, *viz*. in Hell; for if they be under no Law (as Mr. *Simſon* ſays they are not) there can be no Diſconformity in their Natures to the Law; becauſe there being no Law, they can be under no Obligation to Conformity to it. 4*thly*. I would know, what it is in their State, that makes them uncapable of being under the Preceptive Part of the Law? It muſt either be, becauſe they are meerly Paſſive in that miſerable State, but we have already conſidered, and diſproved this; or that they have not freedom of chooſing the contrary; but this deſtroys not their Freedom, otherwiſe there would be no freedom in Heaven; for there they cannot chooſe the contrary, or that their Torment allows not the leaſt wandering Thought: But this may as well be applied to their Happineſs in Heaven (*mutatis*

mu-

mutandis) Or that the Law hath its full Implement upon them, as to the Penalty or Puniſhment: But this Reaſon will alſo prove, That the glorified in Heaven are not under the Preceptive Part of the Law; for it hath its full Implement upon them as to the Promiſe of a Reward, and the glorified, have no further Reward to expect, more than the Damned, have further Puniſhment to fear. 5*thly*. I think his calling their perfect Subjection, to the Puniſhment of the Law, a moral Subjection to be not ſo proper; becauſe, Moral Subjection properly Reſpects, ſuch a Subjection as binds to Duty, and obliges to beware of ſin; but their Subjection to Puniſhment, is only the Conſequent of this. So that according to him, the Principal Part of their moral Subjection to the Law, and Dependence upon GOD, in that Place of Torment ceaſeth; and therefore according to him, their moral Subjection to the Preceptive Part of the Law is only temporary, but as to the Threatning it is eternal: So that the Law to them, is eternal only as to the Sanction, not to the Preceptive Part.

THIS he ſays, *agrees exactly with the Scripture Account of the State of the Damned, &c.* But, 1*ſt*. Hell being the Place deſigned for the full Puniſhment of the wicked; therefore the Scripture points mainly, at what is penal in that State, and ſpeaks but little of their ſinning there; becauſe their Puniſhment, ſuppoſes, That they die in their ſins, and ſo carrying their ſinful Natures with them, and that they are ſtill ſinning; even as Heaven is principally deſcribed from the State of their Happineſs there. 2*dly*. Their ſtanding ſpeechleſs

leſs, bound Hand and Foot, proves not, That they are meerly Paſſive, or that they are not under the Preceptive Part of the Law; it only points out, *Firſt*, Clear Convictions of the Equity of the Sentence, which if it be a formal Act of the Conſcience, and a Duty here, I know not what ſhould hinder it to be ſo then. *2dly*. It points out the Inevitableneſs of the Puniſhment, but no Way that they are meerly Paſſive; for it is impoſſible, that the Free Will can be meerly Paſſive in its immanent Acts; whatever Influences external Cauſes may have upon the free Will.

3. THEIR being caſt into utter Darkneſs, or into the Lake that burneth with Fire, points out their extream Torment, but no Way proves, That they are meerly Paſſive; or that they are not under the Preceptive Part of the Law, as is plain; for this is the Lot of the Souls of wicked Men at Death, to be caſt into that Lake; and yet he himſelf reſtricts ſinning in Hell to the Day of Judgment. *4thly*. Their weeping, and gnaſhing of Teeth, as little proves this; it points out their extream Torment; yea their gnaſhing of Teeth points out as the Conſequent of their Torment, their Rage, Diſpair, and Freting, as it does generally in all Places, where we read of it, as *Pſal.* 112. *ult. Job* 16. 9. *Pſal.* 37. 12. In which Places it is certain, that both their Rage and Torment are implied: Nor doth its being expreſſed when applied to the Damned by a Paſſive Word, as, βρύγμος ὀδόντων imply ſimply a meer Paſſion, but it imports the Cauſe that occaſions both their gnaſhing of Teeth and their Rage,

viz.

viz. Their extream Torment, as ſeems plain from *Rev.* 16. 9, 10. where they are ſaid, *to wit*, the Worſhippers of the Beaſt, *to blaſpheme the Name of GOD*, and the 10. verſe *to gnaw their Tongues for Pain*: Now I ſuppoſe, That here is a Repreſentation of what will be more fully the State of ſuch Perſons in Hell. Beſides, *Nouns* derived from paſſive *Verbs* are often times of an Active Signification, as that very Word is uſed, *Prov.* 19. 12. where it is rendered, *the roring of a Lion*. And as it is rendered in theſe Places of the *Septuagint*, where the Word in the *Hebrew* is of an active Signification: Nor is in ſome Places the expreſſing of a Perſon againſt whom they gnaſh their Teeth material, ſince in other Places the active *Verb* is uſed where there is no Mention of the Perſon, as *Pſal.* 112. *ult.* 5*thly*. Indeed they do not act from Choice *i. e.* they cannot act otherwiſe, partly from the Corruption of their Nature, partly from their exquiſite Torments they are under; but that ſays not they are meerly Paſſive, more than in Heaven: Where by Reaſon of the Holineſs of their Nature in their Confirmed State of Happineſs, it is impoſſible for them not to Love, and Praiſe GOD. 6*thly*. If the Powers of the Soul be preſerved, their actings cannot be reſtrained, without the Deſtruction of the Powers themſelves; and therefore a Phyſical Reſtraint as to immanent Acts is impoſſible: And as to a moral Reſtraint, that is the taking of the Obligation to the Preceptive Part of the Law; beſide, that it is impoſſible while they exiſt, and are Creatures, upon that Suppoſition a Phyſical Reſtraint of their Power

is needleſs; for blaſpheme and rage as they will, they ſin not, becauſe under no Obligation to the Preceptive Part of the Law. *7thly.* Silencing Convictions and Renting Thoughts, powerfully born in upon ſuch, ſo as they cannot ſhift them, yet are immanent and elicite Acts of the Soul. And therefore it is impoſſible they can be meer Paſſions. I ſuppoſe ſuch tormenting Convictions and Thoughts can never be without a ſecret Deſire, and Wiſh to get theſe Convictions and Thoughts waved, were it but for a Time, as we ſee the Rich Glutton deſired ſome Mitigation of his Torments, but ſuch Deſires are not meer Paſſions.

LASTLY, He adds, *If there be ſinning in Hell, GOD could never be glorified by the Puniſhment Inflicted upon ſuch*; For ſays he, *if there be ſtill ſinning to Eternity, it is impoſſible for GOD to repair his Honour by inflicting of due Puniſhment*; But, 1*ſt.* Will not the Argument prove, That there will be no Perſevering Holineſs in Heaven, becauſe it will be as impoſſible to be adding new Rewards through Eternity. 2*dly.* Whether their ſins be more Heinous in Hell, than in the State of Probation is needleſs to determine. 3*dly.* He confounds a State of Probation and a confirmed State. 4*thly.* He conſequently confounds the Law, conſidered as a ſimple Law, and as a Covenant confirmed with Promiſes and Threatnings; for the Law to the Redeemed in Heaven is ſtill a proper Law, and their Holineſs proper Obedience, and yet there is no Promiſe of a Reward to it, becauſe they can expect no more, than what they Enjoy, and is infallibly ſecured to them. So the

Law

Law is ſtill a ſimple Law to the Damned though there is no more Puniſhment to be inflicted on them, than what they are to underly through Eternity. 5*thly*. He ſuppoſes, That in this Caſe Eternal Wrath is threatned to every ſin of the Damned: But this is inconſiſtent with this confirmed State of Miſery, and plainly ſuppoſes a State of Probation. For by the ſame Reaſon there muſt be a Promiſe of Eternal Life to every good Action of the glorified in Heaven; but it is as impoſſible for GOD to be glorified in Rewarding them (for they can enjoy no more than they have) as it is for him to glorifie his Juſtice in inflicting new Puniſhments upon the other. 6*thly*. Since every ſin of the wicked deſerve Hell, and they are guilty here of Millions of ſins, I would have him according to his Way of Reaſoning explain how GOD can glorifie his Juſtice in inflicting all that Puniſhment that theſe Millions of ſins deſerve. 7*thly*. GOD leaves the Damned under the Obligation to the Preceptive Part of the Law, and does not take it off them, even as *Adam*, upon Suppoſition a Remedy had not been provided would have lien under an Obligation to the Law; becauſe while a Rational Creature exiſts, a moral Obligation of Obedience to its Creator can never be cancelled 8*thly*. GOD is ſtill glorified, tho' they be ſtill ſinning, and new Puniſhments cannot be inflicted. 1*ſt*. Becauſe Threatnings and Rewards belong properly to a State of Probation. 2*dly*. Becauſe their ſinning ſtill juſtifies GOD in their Puniſhment. 3*dly*. Becauſe their ſinning and Hatred and Rage againſt GOD is no ſmall Branch of their Miſery

an

and Punishment. 4*thly*. Because it further confirms them in their miserable State, even as the Holiness of the glorified in Heaven confirms them in their Happiness, though it be otherways unchangeable, and is the Mean of the Continuation of it. 5*thly*. Because their sinning is a Natural Consequent of their having corrupt Natures, which he himself owns, they carry with them to Hell. AND if their having sinful Natures in Hell does not reflect upon GOD's Honour; neither does their actual sinning: For all Divines own, Original sin to be greater than any actual sin; And it is as absurd to say, that a sinful Nature can be chained up from actual sinning, through all Eternity, as to say, that a Creature perfectly Holy can be chained up from performing any good Act; so that I conceive his Argument is not of great Force.

I could have wished, That this Question had been waved; and that Professor *Simson* had not vented his Judgement upon this Head; But since it hath happened so, and that it makes up a Part of his Systeme and Scheme, we shall offer some Arguments upon this Head. 1*st*. He confesses, that they have their corrupt Natures in Hell still, and therefore they are under the preceptive Part of the Law, and so sin; for the Law condemns Corruption of Nature, as well as sins of Life: Now if they be under no Obligation to the preceptive Part of the Law, then their corrupt Natures ceases plainly to be such; For where there is no Law, there can be no Disconformity to it; or if they be under the Law, as to a Conformity of Nature, I see not why they are not under the Law, as to

Conformity of Life. 2*dly*. I would know what is the Reason why there is no sinning in Hell, it must either be, 1*st*. The clear Convictions of the Equity of the Punishment, but this cannot be; for the cleareſt Convictions where the Nature is universally corrupted, and Men under the greateſt Torments can never reſtrain from ſinning, as is plain to any that conſiders it; Yea, this would be a great moral Attainment, to be under clear Convictions of the Equity of the Torments, and yet not to ſin or fret. Or 2*ly*. It muſt flow from the greatneſs of the Torments, but if begun Plagues here on Earth make wicked Men rage and blaſpheme, much more the Perfection of theſe Torments in Hell. Beſides the greatneſs of Pleaſure and Happineſs, does not hinder the actual Holineſs of the Redeemed in Heaven; and therefore neither does the Greatneſs of the Torment of the other hinder their actual ſinning, but rather occaſion it, conſidering the Corruption of their Nature. 3*dly*. Or it is, becauſe the Torments filling all the Powers of their Souls to the Brim, they are only paſſive Recipients, and have only a tormenting Senſation of their Miſery, but have no Leaſure to act, but this we have diſproved before; For by the ſame Reaſon, there will be no Holineſs in Heaven, and the Redeemed will be only paſſive Recipients of that Glory, ſeeing the Souls of the Glorified are as much filled with the Joys of Heaven as the other are with the Torments of Hell, and the firſt are called Veſſels of Mercy as the other are called Veſſels of Wrath; Beſides, do not the Damned remember their Mercies they ſlighted, the Sins they commited? Theſe are formal Immanent Acts

of

of the Soul, and cannot be meer paſſions; However influenced by their Sufferings. Further, it is impoſſible to conceive how their Sufferings conſidering the Corruption of their Natures in which they are confirmed, ſhould not produce Rage and Deſpair. Or, 4*thly*. It muſt be, becauſe GOD by his avenging Power, layes a phyſical Reſtraint upon the Faculties, that they cannot Act. But, 1*ſt*. If they be under no Obligation to the preceptive Part of the Law, there is no need of any Reſtraint at all, and therefore there is no ſuch Reſtraint; for not being under the preceptive Part of the Law, let them do what they will, let them curſe or blaſpheme, they ſin not; becauſe they are under no Law, obliging them to forbear theſe. 2*dly*. Such a phyſical Reſtraint of the immanent Acts of the Soul, is impoſſible upon Suppoſition, that the Faculties be preſerved: Indeed GOD may chain up the imperate Acts of the free Will; But as to elicite Acts, tho' GOD by his Secret Workings may divert ſuch particular Acts of the Will, yet the Will and Powers can never be ſimply reſtrained from all Actings, without the Deſtruction of the Powers themſelves.

OR, 5*thly*. It muſt be, becauſe their ſins could never be puniſhed, if they were ever ſinning; and ſo GOD's Juſtice could never be glorified in the puniſhing of their ſins. But this we have already conſidered; And beſides, every ſin committed here by a Sinner, deſerves eternal Puniſhment and Vengeance, but it ſeems hardly poſſible for a Creature, if all the Hells, that all his ſins deſerve were put upon him to bear that; and therefore that Argument muſt not be ſtretched too far.

OR, *6thly*. Because they are not under the preceptive Part of the Law; And if so, this must be either, *1st*. Because the Law hath its full Implement upon them in the full Execution of the Sanction, so that there can be no further Punishments inflicted upon them for new sins. But will not this also prove, that the Glorified in Heaven are not under the preceptive Part of the Law, for it hath its full Implement upon them as to the Promise of Reward, and they can expect no further Reward, than they are actually possessed of. Or, *2dly*. It must be, because it were a Reflection upon GOD, if he could not do what Magistrates can do here with Malefactors, whom they can put out of a Capacity of Transgressing the Laws any more, by cutting them off; But this Reason is weak, and an *Arminian* Argument, for the Reason why the Malefactors then cease, to be under an Obligation to the Laws, is, because they exist no more in the Land of the Living, and thereby their Relation as Subjects ceases; So that if Sinners by the Execution of the Sentence were annihilated, then indeed their Obligation to the preceptive Part of the Law would cease; But in Hell they exist, and are in Being as Rational Creatures, no less than when on Earth, and therefore their Obligation to the Law can never cease, and they have still the Exercise of their Reason; for there they Remember their evil Deeds, which is one of the highest Exercises of the Rational Faculties: As for what he speaks of passive Remembering or Reflection, we have already considered it; for tho' GOD influence their Remembering of their sins against their Will, yet they are formal Agents.

And

And therefore it is plain, That their Obligation to the preceptive Part of the Law ſtill remains. 3*dly*. I would know what is the Foundation of the moral Obligation of the preceptive Part of the Law upon Men; it muſt either be, 1*ſt*. the hope of Reward and Puniſhment, but this cannot be, in regard this belongs to a State of Probation; for ſo Men were under no moral Obligation to Obedience in Heaven, becauſe there they are beyond fear of Puniſhment, and have no further Reward to expect. So that this way Men are only under the preceptive Part of the Law, while in this World. Or, 2*dly*. The Foundation of this muſt be GOD's Arbitrary Pleaſure, whereby he gives the Creature a Law or not, as he ſees meet; But if ſo, then GOD could make a Rational Creature, and yet preſcribe no Law to it; But this is generally acknowledged to be very groſs, for all ſound Divines grant, That there are ſome Things he cannot but do, upon Suppoſition of his doing another Thing, as here, if he make a Rational Creature, he muſt preſcribe it a Law, his Wiſdom and Holineſs require it. Or, 3*dly*. It muſt be the Poſſibility of their Obedience and Diſobedience; but this Reaſon will prove, there is no Law in Heaven, for it's as impoſſible for them in Heaven to ſin, as it's for the other to obey; beſides that it ſounds harſh to ſay, That Men by their Sin ſhould bring themſelves into ſuch a State, wherein they are diſcharged from any Obligation of giving the Homage of Obedience due to their Creator. Further I ever thought, That the Law had been eternal, as well with reſpect to the preceptive Part, as to the Sanction thereof, for the Command is the principal

Part

Part of the Law; whereas the Sanction is only acceſſary to confirm and ſtrengthen the Command. The Command is founded upon the Holineſs of GOD's Nature; And we ſee in Heaven, it binds ſtill where the Sanction as to the Promiſe is as fully Implemented as the Threatning is in Hell. Or, Laſtly, it muſt be their having their Being from him, and Dependance on him as Rational Creatures; but this Ground continuing in Hell, proves that they are even then under the preceptive Part of the Law, and indeed the Obligation to moral Obedience is founded upon this Bottom by all ſound Divines.

4. WILL any ſay, That ſuch are not obliged to love GOD, and to acknowledge the Equity of GOD's Judgments in Reference to themſelves. To deny this I think ſounds harſh, yea, he himſelf ſays, That they have clear and ſilencing Convictions, which takes in two eminent Branches of Sinners Duty under GOD's Judgments, *1ſt.* To be clearly convinced of the Equity thereof. *2dly.* To be ſilent and not repine, to ſay they are purely Paſſive in theſe is hardly good Senſe, becauſe being Elicite Acts of the Soul, it is impoſſible they can be pure Paſſions as we have ſhewed before; Beſides do we not read of the Worm that never dies, *Mark*: 9. Which Divines explain of the ſharp Challenges, and gnawing Accuſation of the Conſcience. It is true that GOD by ſecret Workings, makes Conſcience upbraid and accuſe, as alſo that they cannot but wiſh, that their Conſcience were ſilent, as when on Earth, but that no more makes Conſcience meerly paſſive, than when the Conſciences of ſome Sinners here on Earth are awakened

awakened to accuſe and torment them, the Conſcience is ſtill a formall Agent.

5. I ever thought, That Hell had been the very Reverſe of Heaven, and that as Heaven is a Place, not only of compleat Pleaſure and Happineſs, but alſo of perfect Conformity to GOD, and perfect ſerving and praiſing him: So Hell had been a Place not only of compleat Miſery, but alſo of ſinning againſt, and blaſpheming GOD. But now, it ſeems, That Hell comes pretty near Heaven with Reference to one Branch, which is eſteemed by the Godly one of the chiefeſt, *viz.* There is, according to this Opinion, no more actual ſinning againſt GOD in Hell, than there is in Heaven. And it ſeems, That the great thing, that makes Hell ſo frightful to the Godly, *viz.* That in that Place there is nothing but Hatred againſt GOD, Rage and Blaſphemy, which uſes to be more frightful to them, than the Pains themſelves; is but the Effect of their Weakneſs; for if there be no ſinning in Hell, there is no Ground for ſuch Fear: And ſo it ſeems Hell is only to be feared for the Torments thereof, and Heaven is to be chiefly deſired for the Pleaſure thereof, which is agreeable enough to his Doctrine of Man's own Happineſs, being his ultimate End.

IT is needleſs to ſay, That in Hell they are reſtrained from ſinning, whereas in Heaven they voluntarly abſtain from it, for beſides, that we have diſproved this formerly, even upon that Suppoſition, the State of the Wicked in Hell is more deſirable, than when they were upon Earth: For all grant, Sin to be a greater Evil, than any Miſery

Miſery or Torment; but while they were on Earth they were ſtill ſinning; whereas according to this Opinion, in Hell they ſin none at all; and therefore their State is better, even upon Suppoſition they be powerfully reſtrained from ſinning: We find GOD's People count it a Mercy, to be reſtrained from ſinning, though it were by an heavy and afflicting Rod.

6. WHY may not ſinning be a Part of their Miſery there, ſince it is oftimes a Puniſhment here on Earth; and ſince it is indeed the greateſt of all Miſeries, as well as Holineſs in Heaven is a great Part of their Happineſs; for in Heaven they can expect no further Reward, as in Hell they have no further Puniſhment to fear.

7. IS it poſſible for Men, to be under extream Torment, to have their Souls inlarged to receive GOD's Wrath, to ſee themſelves ſhut up in that State without Hope, and not to be filled, not only with Deſpair (which ſure is no more Paſſion, more than Hope is) but with Anger, Fretting, Rage, *&c.* Yea, does not a great Part of their Miſery ly in the ſtinging Accuſations and Challenges of their Conſciences, for their Sins, committed while in this World, and the Sorrow and Rage, that muſt needs follow thereupon. Now if this not ſinning flow from the Clearneſs of Conviction, this is a greater Attainment than is reached upon Earth by Saints; or if GOD bind them up from Fretting and Rage, by his Almighty Power; this is to aſſert an Eternal Miracle, yea, it is impoſſible; for the Soul, being a Spirit, and ſo of an active Nature muſt vent it ſelf, either in a ſilent, or meek Submiſſion, or in Rage and

and fretting; for GOD no more destroys the natural Actings of the Soul in Hell, sutable to its present Circumstances, more than he does restrain the natural Actings of the Souls of the glorified in Heaven.

8. And lastly, He confines this not sinning in Hell, to the last Judgment; and so seems plainly to grant, That there will be sinning in Hell till that Time. Now I would know, why there is sinning in Hell now, more than after the Day of Judgment. Is it becaus the full Punishment is not yet inflicted upon them: But will not that also prove, That there is no Obedience nor Holiness in Heaven, after the Day of Judgment? I would know, to what End the Spirits in Prison are obliged to love and fear GOD, according to his Principles (for if there be sinning in Hell now, they must needs be obliged to love and fear GOD) since such plainly see themselves shut up in Despair: Or, will he say, That by forbearing to sin, they may mitigate their Torments, when the full Execution comes? But this is plainly strange; for this supposes, they may in some Measure forbear sinning. 2*dly*. It says there is some Room for Threatnings there; both which are inconsistent with the unchangeable State, in which they are shut up. But I enter no further into this Depth. I conceive, If there be sinning in Hell now, there will be also af- the Day of Judgment: And if there be no sinning then, neither is there now. In short, this Opinion seems to be contrary to Scripture, Analogy of Faith, and to lead to dangerous Precipices, as to

found

found Obedience, upon the Hope of Reward and Fear of Puniſhment, and to make Mens chief Motive here in abſtaining from Sin, to be Fear of Hell Torments, which agrees very well with his Doctrine concerning Man's ultimate End.

As to Mr. *Hog's* Arguments referred to by Mr. *Webſter*, he ſays, *P.* 236. *That Mr.* Hog *has either acted the Part of a Man, who anſwers a Thing before he hear it; or elſe hath widely miſtaken, what it was he deſigned to refute: For*, ſays he, *there is not one ſolid Argument advanced by Mr.* Hog, *againſt any Branch of his Opinion, which he refers to the Reader to compare.*

BUT Mr. *Hog*, and ſome others alſo, hear'd Profeſſor *Simſon* upon this Head pretty fully at *Edinburgh*, where he expreſly ſaid, *They acquieſced in the Puniſhment*, tho' now he denies it; but they that heard cannot truſt their Memories, ſo as to depone *ipſiſſima Verba*; and therefore Mr. *Hog* was not altogether like a Man that anſwers a Matter before he hear it. 2*dly*. Whether Mr. *Hog's* Arguments be ſolid or not, we refer to the Reader, as he doth: Only we remark, That this was a proper Occaſion and Place, to have refuted Mr. *Hog's* Arguments, and then we might have probably underſtood more of his Mind from his Anſwers.

NEXT Mr. *Simſon* produceth ſeveral Authorities to convince Mr. *Hog*, *and other excellent ones in the Earth*, that this Opinion is not ſingular. But 1*ſt*. I wiſh he had forborn that bitter *Sarcaſm* (*of Excellent ones*) for that his Opinion in this is Matter of Grief, and Offence to many truly Judicious and Godly, is a thing very certain. It looks

looks not well, when Men of a *Presbyterian Perſwaſion* vent more Bitterneſs of Spirit againſt People truly Godly than they do againſt *Malignants*, *Arminians* and others of lax Principles. 2*dly*. As to the Authors he cites, I acknowledge he has ſome Authors for him; But I remark, *firſt*, That if any Reformed Divines have any Chaff cleaving to them, as ſeverals of them may have, he readily licks up that; ſo that as it were he gathers up the Chaff and Droſs, that cleaves to many of them. 2*dly*. If this were the only Error maintained by him, it were more venial; but when this is conſidered, with the Syſteme of Errors maintained by him, whereby the Frame of our Doctrine is ſo much altered, the Caſe varies very much. 3*dly*. This is the Opinion maintained by *Arminians*, or near a Kin to it.

The firſt he cites is *Auſtine* in his *Enchirid: ad Laurent: Cap*: 3. Where ſpeaking of Men and Angels, of the Godly and Wicked, after the Reſurrection, he ſays, *Iſtis Voluntas, illis Facultas, non poterit eſſe ulla peccandi, vel ulla Conditio moriendi*, &c. *i. e. Then the Godly ſhall have no Will to ſin, and the Wicked ſhall have no Power to ſin;* But it is there granted, *That then the Wicked ſhall have a Will to ſin; i. e.* 1*ſt*. A corrupt ſinful Nature, which Mr. *Simſon* grants; but it is as impoſſible for a corrupt Nature, while ſuch, to be without actual ſinning, as for a Nature perfectly holy to be without actual Holineſs. 2*dly*. A will to ſin takes plainly in actual Inclinations and Motions to ſin, as is obvious from *Rom:* 7. where *Paul* ſays, *To will is preſent with me*, &c. 3*dly*. Therefore the *Facultas*, or Power of ſinning, which they are ſaid to

to want, muſt be underſtood of the overt and external Acts of Sin; eſpecially ſuch as they committed while on Earth, ſuch as *Theft*, *Murder*, *&c.* but cannot be underſtood of *Hatred*, *Envy*, *Indignation*, which are certainly included in the Will to ſin, which *Auſtine* affirms they will ſtill have, *&c.*

2. As little does the Teſtimony cited out of *Proſper Aquitanus*, make for him, as is plain to any that will conſider the Words as cited by Mr. *Simſon*, in *Engliſh* it's thus; *What is it to bind them, being ſpeechleſs, Hand and Foot, but to be deprived of acting in Hell, where none confeſſeth to GOD. The weeping and gnaſhing of Teeth, points out their moſt ſharp Torments, who being adjudged to eternal Death, are never to have any Senſation of laughing, but of Sorrow, &c.* Where it's plain, *Proſper* only ſays, that in Hell none confeſſeth to GOD, *i. e.* Praiſe him, and that their Pains in Hell are ſuch, as they laugh none, *i. e.* have no Perception of Joy, which is very true; but he ſpeaks not a Word of not ſinning in Hell, So then the firſt two Teſtimonies make little for him.

3. As to two School-Men cited by him, *viz. Bonaventura*, and *Albertus Magnus*; We remark in general, That the School-Men generally abound with Errors. And therefore the leſs ſtreſs is to be laid on their Authority; I Wiſh he had cited their Words.

4. As to the *Lutheran* Divine *Conrad Dannhauer*, I never ſaw his Book; and ſince he cites but a Sentence, from the Second Hand, and not from the Book it ſelf: We can hardly judge of his Opinion this Way, ſince the Words as cited by

by Mr. *Simſon*, are capable of another Senſe, *viz.* That there will be a Meaſure and Bounds ſet to Blaſphemies and ſins againſt GOD.

5. I grant, that *Sandford* and *Parker*, are of Mr. *Simſon*'s Opinion on this Head; but he readily licks up the chaff that cleaves to any Reformed Divine, more than he follows their ſound Doctrine, and this Opinion as maintained by him is to be conſidered as it makes up a Part of his new Syſteme.

6. THOUGH he differ from *Jurieu*, in that he makes the wicked meerly Paſſive in Hell, yet he agrees with him in the Main, *viz.* That in Hell there is no Law, and ſo no ſinning.

7. IT's ſtrange, that he refutes yearly *Jurieu*'s Opinion ſince *Jurieu* expreſly ſays, *There is no Law, and ſo no ſinning in Hell*; which alſo Mr. *Simſon* hath been at the pains to prove in his written Defences; indeed he differs from *Jurieu* in one Branch, for he makes the wicked in Hell meerly Paſſive: Whereas *Jurieu* ſays, they are ever committing new Crimes, and adding Blaſphemies to Blaſphemies, and ſo makes them Agents; only he denies theſe Actions to be ſins, becauſe according to him, they are under no Law, ſo that he and *Jurieu* agree in the Main, *viz.* That there is no ſinning in Hell: It's no wonder he differ from Mr. *Campbel*, for we ſee how in many Things he differs not only from our greateſt Divines, but from the Confeſſion of Faith it ſelf.

8. MACCOBIUS ſeems to be of the ſame Opinion alſo; but it I could find whereon he founds the Obligation of the Rational Creature to moral Obedience, it would help to take up his meaning.

The

THE laſt he names is Doctor *Owen de Juſtificatione. cap:* 12. *pag:* 381, 382, 383. The Words are, *Whether the firſt Intention and Obligation of the Law unto Obedience, does ceaſe to affect the Sinner, or continue ſo, as at the ſame Time to oblige him to Obedience and Puniſhment, both its Powers being in Act towards him.* To which Mr. *Owen*'s Anſwer is thus.

HAD *the Puniſhment threatned, been immediately inflicted unto the outmoſt of what was contained in it, this could have been no Queſtion; for Man had died immediately, both Temporally, and Eternally, and had been caſt out of that State, wherein alone he could ſtand in any Relation to the Preceptive Power of the Law, he that is finally executed, hath fulfilled the Law, ſo as he owes no more Obedience to it.* He alſo refers to *Exercit.* 8. *pag:* 79. *Volume* 1*ſt. on the* Hebrews.

BUT, *Firſt*, I cannot find any Thing to his Purpoſe, in the laſt Place cited in that *Page* 79. 2*dly.* In the firſt Place it's plain, it muſt be underſtood of the Preceptive Part of the Law, as it reſpects a State of Probation and Trial; becauſe *Owen* ſays, *he had upon the Execution of the Sanction, been caſt out of that State, wherein alone he could ſtand under any Relation to the Preceptive Part of the Law*; Now that State out of which he would have been caſt, was a State of Probation, as is plain. 2*dly.* Becauſe, ſo the Saints would not be under the Preceptive Part of the Law in Heaven, for the State in which *Adam* was, was then only the State, according to Mr: *Owen*, in which Man could ſtand under any Relation to the Preceptive Part of the Law. 3*dly.* He himſelf ſays,

Owen

Owen ſpeaks of the Law of Creation given to *Adam*: Now that was plainly a Law that reſpected *Adam*, as put in a State of Probation and Trial, as is plain, and therefore cannot be underſtood ſimply of Diſcharge from the Preceptive Part of the Law, as a Law; for ſo, Devils for preſent were not under the Preceptive Part of the Law, and ſo ſinned not, whatever they did, which is contrary to Scripture, *Joh.* 8. 44. for they are now caſt out of the like State wherein *Adam* was. *4thly.* That Phraſe, *He that is finally executed, hath fulfilled the Law*, ſo as to owe no more Obedience to it, is of no Force to his Purpoſe, a Man when puniſhed capitally owes no more Obedience to the Law, becauſe he thereby no more exiſts in this World, and ſo his Relation as a Subject is diſſolved; but wicked Men, when in Hell, and the Law finally executed upon them, ceaſe not to exiſt in GOD's Univerſe, and to be Rational Creatures, and therefore are ſtill under the Preceptive Part of the Law. *5thly.* It's plain, from what Mr. *Owen* adds *page* 283. *viz.* That if a wicked Servant be puniſhed with a Puniſhment, that continues his Being, and Relation of a Servant his Obligation to Obedience, is not thereby diſſolved, only if the Puniſhment be Capital, ſuch as deſtroys his very Being, then the Obligation to Obedience ceaſes; Now the Puniſhment in Hell takes not away, the Phyſical Being of the wicked as Rational Creatures, and conſequently diſſolves not their Obligation to the preceptive Part of the Law, indeed the Relation as Servants ceaſes, but that implying a Paction and Covenant, ſays only that the Relation to the preceptive Part

of

THE laſt he names is Doctor *Owen de Juſtificatione. cap:* 12. *pag:* 381, 382, 383. The Words are, *Whether the firſt Intention and Obligation of the Law unto Obedience, does ceaſe to affect the Sinner, or continue ſo, as at the ſame Time to oblige him to Obedience and Puniſhment, both its Powers being in Act towards him.* To which Mr. *Owen*'s Anſwer is thus.

HAD *the Puniſhment threatned, been immediately inflicted unto the outmoſt of what was contained in it, this could have been no Queſtion; for Man had died immediately, both Temporally, and Eternally, and had been caſt out of that State, wherein alone he could ſtand in any Relation to the Preceptive Power of the Law, he that is finally executed, hath fulfilled the Law, ſo as he owes no more Obedience to it.* He alſo refers to *Exercit.* 8. *pag:* 79. *Volume* 1*ſt. on the* Hebrews.

BUT, *Firſt*, I cannot find any Thing to his Purpoſe, in the laſt Place cited in that *Page* 79. 2*dly.* In the firſt Place it's plain, it muſt be underſtood of the Preceptive Part of the Law, as it reſpects a State of Probation and Trial; becauſe *Owen* ſays, *he had upon the Execution of the Sanction, been caſt out of that State, wherein alone he could ſtand under any Relation to the Preceptive Part of the Law*; Now that State out of which he would have been caſt, was a State of Probation, as is plain. 2*dly.* Becauſe, ſo the Saints would not be under the Preceptive Part of the Law in Heaven, for the State in which *Adam* was, was then only the State, according to Mr: *Owen*, in which Man could ſtand under any Relation to the Preceptive Part of the Law. 3*dly.* He himſelf ſays,

Owen

Owen ſpeaks of the Law of Creation given to *Adam*: Now that was plainly a Law that reſpected *Adam*, as put in a State of Probation and Trial, as is plain, and therefore cannot be underſtood ſimply of Diſcharge from the Preceptive Part of the Law, as a Law; for ſo, Devils for preſent were not under the Preceptive Part of the Law, and ſo ſinned not, whatever they did, which is contrary to Scripture, *Joh.* 8. 44. for they are now caſt out of the like State wherein *Adam* was. 4*thly*. That Phraſe, *He that is finally executed, hath fulfilled the Law*, ſo as to owe no more Obedience to it, is of no Force to his Purpoſe, a Man when puniſhed capitally owes no more Obedience to the Law, becauſe he thereby no more exiſts in this World, and ſo his Relation as a Subject is diſſolved; but wicked Men, when in Hell, and the Law finally executed upon them, ceaſe not to exiſt in GOD's Univerſe, and to be Rational Creatures, and therefore are ſtill under the Preceptive Part of the Law. 5*thly*. It's plain, from what Mr. *Owen* adds *page* 283. *viz.* That if a wicked Servant be puniſhed with a Puniſhment, that continues his Being, and Relation of a Servant his Obligation to Obedience, is not thereby diſſolved, only if the Puniſhment be Capital, ſuch as deſtroys his very Being, then the Obligation to Obedience ceaſes; Now the Puniſhment in Hell takes not away, the Phyſical Being of the wicked as Rational Creatures, and conſequently diſſolves not their Obligation to the preceptive Part of the Law, indeed the Relation as Servants ceaſes, but that implying a Paction and Covenant, ſays only that the Relation to the preceptive Part

of

of the Law is diſſolved, as it hath a Relation to Promiſe and Reward, not ſimply as a Law, which ſtill hath place in Heaven, where there is neither fear of Puniſhment, nor hope of Reward, *&c.*

PROFESSOR *Simſon* ſays, *Pag:* 242. *That the only way of Reconciling this Opinion with the true Notion of the Eternal Law, by which all rational Creatures, while they have a Being, are Subject to the Sovereign Dominion of GOD, in his humble Opinion is, That the final Sentence inflicted on Sinners, layes them under the moſt dreadful Sufferings, and perfectly reſtrains them from the leaſt Act of Sin.* But, 1*ſt.* It ſeems according to Mr. *Simſon*, the Law is eternal with Reference to the wicked, only as to its Sanction, not as to its preceptive Part, which I conceive to be new and ſtrange. 2*dly.* I would know what it is that formally founds an Obligation on the Rational Creatures to moral Obedience, if it be GOD's Infinite Supereminency and the rational Creature's Dependence on him as ſuch, then this Reaſon being perpetual in all Conditions, wicked Men in Hell Remain ſtill under an Obligation to the preceptive Part of the Law. 3*dly.* He ſeems to make GOD's reſtraining them from the leaſt Act of Sin, the Reaſon why they are not under the preceptive Part of the Law: But this we have already diſproved. Further I would know, whether GOD may not in a Conſiſtency with his Holineſs forbear to reſtrain them from Acts of ſinning, to ſay he cannot I conceive to be hard, for it is to ſay, GOD puts the Damned in ſuch a ſtate, in which he cannot in a Conſiſtency with his Holineſs, allow them the Exerciſe of their Liberty, ſuitable to the Circumſtances they are in;

Be-

Besides GOD's Providential Restraining wicked Men here from sinning, does not dissolve the Obligation upon them to forbear these sins, from which they are restrained. And if GOD can forbear to restrain them from sinning, then their sinning in Hell is not inconsistent with GOD's Holiness.

As to what Mr. *Simson* answers about passive Reflection, and passive Gnashing of the Teeth, we have already considered it; and therefore shall not add any more upon that Head, but only conclude with two Remarks (that shew, That even this Point is of some Moment) and to which this Doctrine naturally leads. 1*st*. That there is no formal Obedience in Heaven, nor Exercise of Free-will, which is the *Arminian* Opinion; but that the Saints in Heaven keep GOD's Law, only as meer natural Agents. 2*dly*: It leads to take up Hell as a Place only of meer Torments, and not of sinning also, and so to make Men only fear Hell as a Place of Torment, and so makes one Ground why the Godly fear Hell, *viz.* as being a Place of continual sinning against GOD, to be a groundless Imagination and Dream.

CHAP XI.

Concerning Justifying Faith.

THE Article here libelled is, *That Mr.* Simson *maintains that justifying Faith, includes in its formal Conception and Nature, good Works and Obedience.*

THIS he denies to be his Opinion; or that ever he taught it.

AND to convince us, That this is not his Opinion, he sets down Mr. *Webster's* Question with his Answer thereto The Question *Pag.* 245. is, *Doth Faith which is the antecedent Condition of the* Covenant of Grace, *and of Justification, include in its Nature, Obedience to the whole moral Law? Or doth the* Act of Faith, qua *justifying, lay hold on Christ* qua *Lord, and include in its Nature a sincere Engagment to an holy Life and good Works?* This Question he calls confused, Ambiguous, and made up of such doubtful Expressions, as he cannot comprehend the Meaning.

WE shall shortly set down the Substance of his Answer, *1st. He supposes That by Condition, is not meant a Condition in the strict Law Sense, when applied to conditional Contracts among Men; but some Thing that is necessarily join'd with and must needs in Order of Nature, at least precede a Person's actual Interest in the Covenant, and so go before his Justification.* 2*dly.* He says, *He does not see how Faith can include in it's Nature Obedience to the moral Law, except in these three Respects,* 1st. *As Faith is a Duty required by the moral Law.* 2dly. *As Obedience to the moral Law is its Object, and in this Sense,* he says, *Some Acts of Faith that necessarily preceed a Person's Interest in the Covenant, include in their Nature, or have for their Object, Obedience to the whole moral Law, as that Act of Obedience whereby a convinced Sinner believes, that it was his Duty to obey the whole moral Law. And other Acts include in their Nature Disobedience to the Moral Law, as when a convinced Sinner believes he hath disobeyed the whole Law.* And he says, *Other Acts of Faith abstract from both*

th, ſuch as are theſe Acts of Faith, when the Mind is enlightned that are exerciſed upon the Per-n of the Mediator and his Offices. 3dly. *Another enſe in which Faith may be ſaid to include Obedi-ce in it's Nature, is as it influences Obedience:* nd ſo ſays, *That all Acts of ſaving Faith, whether ey go before, or follow a Perſon's Juſtification, do in-uence to ſome Degree of Obedience.*

Now 1*ſt*. He ſays, *He underſtands not Mr.* ebſter's *Queſtion*: But are not the Terms in hich it is propoſed ordinary Terms of Divi-ity? And it is common with People as *Armini-s* and others, when they ſecretly diſlike a Do-rine, to carp at the Terms whereby it is ex-reſſed. Further, he underſtands not Mr. *Web-r's* Queſtion, and yet he underſtands the *So-nian* Senſe of this, when he tells us, *Pag*: 251. *hat they make Obedience to be the Eſſence of Faith, s it juſtifies, or that Obedience to the End of Life, owing from Faith, is the the Condition of Juſti-cation.* And alſo he tells us, *Pag*: 248. of his nſwers, *That he could not find a fourth Senſe which it includes Obedience in it's Nature.* If it e ſaid, That this Senſe of the *Socinians*, is not roper: Neither are his three Senſes proper lſo. 2*dly*. It is true, that he denies That juſtify-ng Faith includes in it's Nature, and formal Con-eption, good Works and Obedience, which is ery certain: Yet firſt, he does not anſwer, hether Faith as juſtifying, be conſidered as an ct of Obedience to the moral Law, or only elatively, as it lays hold on Chriſt's Righte-uſneſs; which is a material Diſtinction. 2*dly*. e does not diſtinguiſh betwixt Faith conſide-

red as a ſaving Grace, and Faith as juſtifying as it goes out upon Chriſt for Juſtification; And therefore, that Diſtinction of ſome Acts of Faith having Obedience to the whole moral Law for their Object, *&c.* was needleſs, and ſerves not much to illuſtrate the Matter in Hand. For no Body doubts, but that Faith conſidered more generally, hath for it's Object the whole Revelation of GOD's Will. *3dly.* He ſeems to make more Acts of ſaving Faith than one, to preceed Juſtification. But I never thought that Juſtification had immediatly followed upon the very firſt Act of ſaving Faith, *viz.* a Receiving Chriſt for Righteouſneſs. *4thly.* He makes the Act of Faith, whereby a convinced Sinner on the one Hand believes, That Obedience to the whole Law was his Duty; on the other Hand That he is guilty of Diſobedience to the whole Law, to be a ſaving Act of Faith. For Mr *Simſon* here ſpeaks of ſuch a Condition as is neceſſarly joined with, and in Order of Nature, preceeds Juſtification. But I ſuppoſe many may believe both theſe, who never had ſaving Faith. *5thly.* I conceive, he does not anſwer the firſt Part of the Queſtion cloſly, but rather waves it, giving Diſtinctions to little Purpoſe: For he ſhould have *categorically* denied that Part of the Queſtion, That Faith in it's Nature includes Obedience to the whole moral Law; but he is ſo far from that, that he calls it a doubtful Expreſſion: And therefore, gives three Senſes in which Faith may be ſaid to include Obedience in it's Nature. The Terms in the Queſtion, are as clear as in the Article libelled

libelled, which yet he expreſly denies to be his Opinion. *6thly.* Doth he not by his Diſtinctions grant, That in ſome Senſe Faith includes in its Nature, good Works, which I conceive to be a dangerous Way of ſpeaking, and to be like the Dialect of the Adverſaries of the Truth. *7thly.* All the three Senſes he gives, cannot warrant the Expreſſion of Faith's including good Works in its Nature: Not the firſt, when Faith is ſaid, to include good Works, as it is an Act of Obedience it ſelf; becauſe the Expreſſion points out good Works, as diſtinct from the Act of Faith, and the Senſe will be that Faith it ſelf is an Act of Obedience: Beſides, in his Senſe, the Meaning is either ſimply, That Faith is a Duty required by the moral Law; but this is to trifle, and not to anſwer the Queſtion, which ſpeaks of Faith conſidered as juſtifying: Or, the Meaning is, That Faith as juſtifying is conſidered as an Act of Obedience to the moral Law; but ſo Faith does not juſtify relatively, but; abſolutely, as an Act of Obedience to the Law and ſo every good Work as an Act of Obedience to the moral Law, is equally the Condition of Juſtification. The ſecond Senſe, is as improper: For no Body ever doubted, but that ſaving Faith, conſidered more generally, hath for its Object the whole Revelation of GOD's Will: Beſides, if this Branch of Diſtinction anſwer the Queſtion, the Meaning muſt be, That Faith as it hath Obedience, and Diſobedience to the whole Law, for its Object is the Condition of our Juſtification, which I conceive to be ſtrange and dangerous; for which Faith as

juſtifying

juſtifying, only reſpects Chriſt as cloathed with a Righteouſneſs, to anſwer the Law. The third Senſe is as little to the Purpoſe; for Faith can no more be ſaid to include good Works in it's Nature, becauſe it influences to the Production of them, than any other Grace, as Hope, &c. which alſo influences to the Study of Holineſs, 1. *John* 3. 2. Further, If this Branch be applied as an Anſwer to the Queſtion; the Meaning muſt be, That Faith as it influences good Works is the Condition of Juſtification, otherwiſe, this Branch of his Diſtinction no Way illuſtrates the Matter under Conſideration. But I ſuppoſe this is groſs and plainly deſtroys the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs.

I am tempted to think he does not expreſs his Mind, *Pag:* 245. plainly upon this Head, but that he keeps of with long Weapons, which we may gather in part, by conſidering his Anſwer to the Queſtion in the ſecond Dreſs, in which it is propoſed, *viz.* Both the Act of Faith *qua* Juſtifying, lay hold on Chriſt *qua* Lord, and include in its Nature, a ſincere Engagement to an Holy Life and good Works?

To this he Anſwers, *Pag:* 247. *That he does not underſtand* qua *Juſtifying and* qua *Lord,* which he ſays, *are Words he can make no Senſe of,* and that he cannot perceive that they ſerve for any other End then to darken the Truth. 2*dly.* He ſays, *If the Meaning in plain* Scots *be, whether every Act of Faith whereby we accept of Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs, that is prerequiſite to our Juſtification, be an accepting of him under the Notion of our Lord and Supreme Governour.* Then he ſays, *It is not as in the*

Act

Act, whereby we receive him as our Priest, and his Sacrifice as the Meritorious Cause of all Benefites of Grace and Glory. Again he says, *if the Meaning be, whether that Act of Faith, whereby we receive Christ as our Lord, be prerequisite to our Justification, together with other Acts of Saving Faith, that necessarly preceed it.* Then he affirms it is, *Because we must receive a whole Christ, and accept of him and his Righteousness; Not only for Pardon and Glory, but also for Wisdom and Sanctification, and must engage in the strength of his Grace, to study sincere Obedience to the whole Law before we be pardoned or justified.* And says, *Pag.* 248. *This Doctrine is plainly taught in our* Confession of Faith, *Chap.* 14. § 2. *Chap* 15. § 2. 3. *and proved from,* Luk. 13.3,5. *as also agreeable to what Doctor* Owen *hath in his Book on Justification, pag:* 299, 300, 301.

LET us consider thir things a little, 1*st*. I do not understand why he should bogle so much at the Expressions *qua* Justifying and *qua* Lord, being both a Minister and Professor of Divinity; And seing they are Terms commonly used both in Philosophy and Divinity, for certainly Faith in all its Acts is not to be considered as Justifying, and if Christ be both Lord Priest and Prophet, there is not so very great nicety in considering him sometimes under one Relation, sometimes under another; Yea even here in his Answers, *Pag.* 247. He makes use of this Term *qua*, or *as* when he distinguisheth betwixt receiving him as Lord and as Priest. 2*dly*. He does not seem to state the Question fairly, for the Question was not whether Faith whereby we accept of Christ and his Righteousness, doth respect Christ under the Notion

of

of Lord and Supreme Governour; But whether the Act of Faith, as going out to Chriſt for Juſtification, reſpects him alſo as Lord and Governour, to which he does not diſtinctly Anſwer. Yea, 2*dly*, He fairly inſinuates, that ſome Acts of Faith whereby we receive Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs, that are prerequiſite to our Juſtification, reſpect Chriſt as Lord and Governour, which I think dangerous Doctrine. 3*dly*. He ſeems to inſinuate, that every Act of Faith reſpects Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs which is plainly falſe; or elſe that theſe Acts of Faith that reſpect Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs, do alſo terminate upon him as Lord, which is underſtood of theſe Acts ſpecificatively is true; but if they be conſidered formally as going out to Chriſt, for the particular Benefite of Juſtification, is certainly falſe and dangerous, but to this he anſwers not, but waves it. 4*thly*. He ſeems to make the Act of Faith, whereby we receive Chriſt as a Prieſt, to be only a receiving his Sacrifice, as the Meritorious Cauſe of all Saving Benefites, which *Papiſts* and *Arminians* will own, but calls it not a receiving of his Righteouſneſs as ours. 5*thly*. He ſays, *That the Act of Faith, whereby we receive Chriſt as our Lord is a Prerequiſite to our Juſtification, together with other Acts of Saving Faith.* Now this we conceive to be dangerous; For if he mean that Faith as it receives Chriſt as a Lord, is the Condition of our Juſtification, it is a plain Overturning of the Imputation of his Righteouſneſs, becauſe Chriſt as a Lord, is not cloathed with a Righteouſneſs to Anſwer our Juſtification, but only as he is a Prieſt; Or if the Meaning be, That Faith firſt receives Chriſt as a Lord

Lord, e're the Man be juſtified, the Senſe muſt be either that Faith as juſtifying reſpects Chriſt as Lord, but this plainly overturns the Imputation of his Righteouſneſs, as was hinted; or if the Meaning be, That Faith which Juſtifies, reſpects Chriſt not only as Prieſt, but as Prophet and King, then he does not anſwer the Queſtion at all; For Juſtification being the firſt and principal Benefite offered by Chriſt, as comprehending Abſolution from the Curſe, and a Title to Eternal Life; The Queſtion is, How Faith as going out to Chriſt for Juſtification eyes Chriſt, whether as a Prieſt only cloathed with a Righteouſneſs, or alſo as a Lord, but to this Mr. *Simſon* does not Anſwer. *6thly*. It is very true that Faith that juſtifies, receives Chriſt not only for Righteouſneſs, but alſo for Wiſdom and Sanctification, but the Queſtion is, whether Faith as going out to Chriſt for Juſtification, Reſpects him alſo as he is Wiſdom and Sanctification, but to this he gives not a diſtinct Anſwer. *7thly*. It is true every ſincere Believer engages in the Strength of Grace to ſincere Obedience to the whole Law, but firſt Engaging to Obedience is no Act of Saving Faith, far leſs of Juſtifying, as is obvious, for it is reducible to none of the Acts of Faith. *2dly*. Engaging to Obedience preceeds Juſtification, either as a Condition thereof, but this is plainly Groſs, for engaging to Obedience hath no reference to an imputed Righteouſneſs, or 'tis from the Nature of the Thing, but this cannot be, becauſe a Man cannot honeſtly engage to Obedience, till his Perſon be accepted, and ſo he be juſtified, and therefore cannot be a Prerequiſite of Juſtification: Beſides, I do not underſtand how

he

he calls it a Prerequisite of Justification, unless he understand it as a Condition thereof, especially since he makes it a Prerequisite of Justification equally with the Receiving of Christ for Righteousness.

HE says, *Pag:* 248. *That this Doctrine is taught by the Confession of Faith, Chap.* 14 § 2. *Chap.* 15. § 2, 3. and *Luke* 13. 3. 5. But as to *Chap.* 14. § 2. of the *Confession.* I think strange how he should cite that Passage, for his Purpose, it seems he would make a Nose of Wax of the *Confession of Faith*; For 1*st.* That *Paragraph* speaks of Justifying Faith in general, not as it is the Condition of Justification: Now there is a great Difference betwixt these two. 2*dly.* That *Parag:* speaks of all the Fruits of Faith as Obedience to the Commands, so that according to his Reasoning Obedience to the Commands must be a Prerequisite Condition of Justification, which is dangerous Doctrine indeed. 3*dly.* That same *Parag:* tells us, That the Principal Acts of Saving Faith are, *Accepting, Receiving, and Resting upon Christ for Justification, Sanctification, &c.* where Faith alone is the Condition of our Interest in Christ's Benefites, and not one Word of engaging to Obedience, as the *Confession* and *Catechisms* tell us, *That it is by Faith alone we receive Christ,* and so are Justified. See *Shorter Catechism* on the Question, *What is Justification?*

As to the other Passage of the *Confession of Faith, Chap:* 15. § 2. and 3. It seems he'll make Repentance also a Prerequisite and Condition of Justification; which is strange, and new Doctrine, for altho' it be said, *That none can expect Pardon with-*

without Repentance; it follows not that Repentance is a Prerequisite or Condition of Justification; for that is directly contrary to the Question, *What is Justification?* It shews indeed the Qualification of the Person who may lay Claim to Pardon, not what is the Condition of Pardon: Otherwise actual Holiness and Obedience, yea, and Perseverance therein will be the Condition of Pardon. And as to *Luke* 13. 3. 5. where it is said, *Unless we Repent, we must perish,* he knows that *Arminians,* and others adduce this Scripture as an Argument to prove Repentance, as well as Faith to be the Condition of Justification, which is both contrary to Scripture, aud to the Doctrine of this Church: Again our Lord speaks of Perishing, not of Pardoning. And it is certain, that Repentance is absolutely Necessary to prevent Perishing; Besides Repentance here takes in Perseverance, for unless Men persevere in Repentance they will perish.

LASTLY, As to the Testimony cited out of Doctor *Owen*'s Book upon Justification, *Page* 299. it makes nothing to his Purpose, the Words are too long to be cited at large; He says there, *That Evangelical Faith is necessary, in order of Nature unto our Justification by the Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ unto us.* 2*dly.* He says, *That whatsoever is necessary thereunto is in like manner required of us, in order to believing.* 3*dly.* Among these Things he mentions, *Sorrow for sin, Repentance of it, Fear, Resolution to abstain from it, Sincere Endeavours for that End,* &c. 4*thly.* He calls this *Repentance true in its Kind, and a Legal Repentance,* and such he says, *was the Repentance of* Ahab, *and*

of

of the Ninevites *&c.* Now it is plain, 1*ſt.* That Mr. *Owen* ſpeaks of Legal not Evangelical Repentance. 2*dly.* Tho' he ſays, *It goes before Faith and Juſtification*; yet he does not make it a Condition of Juſtification, nor ſays, That Juſtification always follows it, as is plain in the Inſtances of that Repentance he gives, *to wit*, *Ahab*'s Repentance and the *Ninevites*.

PAGE 248. From this he ſays, *it is manifeſt, that he aſſerts no ſuch Thing, That juſtifying Faith includes in its formal Conception and Nature, good Works and Obedience:* But whether he aſſert this or not, I determine not; but from what we have remarked, we conceive it pretty plain, That he makes good Works and Obedience Prerequiſites, and the Condition of Juſtification no leſs than Faith. 2*dly.* He ſays, he determines the meaning of that doubtful Expreſſion, *viz.* Faith which is the Antecedent Condition of the Covenant of Grace, and of Juſtification; And ſays, *He takes it for any one, or all theſe Acts of Faith which are neceſſarly joined with, and muſt needs in order of Nature, at leaſt preceed a Perſons actual Intereſt in the Covenant, and ſo go before his Juſtification:* But 1*ſt.* how he comes to call Faith's being an Antecedent Condition of Juſtification, a doubtful Expreſſion I cannot underſtand, ſince it is an ordinary and uſual Term of Divinity. 2*dly.* If by all theſe Acts of Faith, he mean the three Senſes, in which he ſays, Faith may be ſaid to include in its Nature Obedience to the Moral Law, then it ſeems that Faith conſidered as an Act of Obedience to the Moral Law, and Faith as it has Obedience to the Law for its Object, and as it in-

influenceth Obedience are Prerequiſites, and ſo a Condition of Juſtification, which I conceive to be ſtrange and dangerous Doctrine; for I cannot conceive why he makes Faith under theſe three Conſiderations to preceed Juſtification, becauſe the ſubject Matter leads him to ſpeak of Faith as juſtifying. 3*dly* He ſays, he explains that doubtful Expreſſion, *Doth Faith in its Nature include Obedience to the Law?* of which he ſays he gave three Senſes. But, 1*ſt*. I ſtill think ſtrange, why he ſhould call this a doubtful Expreſſion, ſeing it is a very common Term in Divinity. 2*dly*. We had occaſion already to conſider theſe three Senſes, only ſince he here repeats them, we ſhortly remark, 1*ſt*. That the Queſtion is not whether Faith that neceſſarly goes before Juſtification, be an Act of Obedience, or is all the Obedience required to the Moral Law? But whether Faith as juſtifying be conſidered as an Act of Obedience to the Moral Law? to which he anſwers nothing. 2*dly*. Neither is the Queſtion, Whether ſome Acts of Faith, that preceed Juſtification have Obedience and Diſobedience to the Law for their Object? But 1*ſt*. Whether the Act of Faith that has Obedience to the Law for its Object, be ſtill followed with Juſtification? which is plainly falſe; for many are convinced and believe, that Obedience to the Law is their Duty, and yet never come to be juſtified. 2*dly*. The Queſtion is, Whether Faith as it hath Obedience to the whole Law, for its Object be juſtifying or the Condition of our Juſtification, which he does not anſwer diſtinctly? 3*dly*. Neither alſo is the Queſtion whether Faith that preceeds Juſtification, any way influences

O-

Obedience to the whole moral Law? But 1*ſt*. Whether Faith produceth ſaving Obedience in a Man before he be juſtified? 2*dly*. Whether Faith, conſidered as influencing Obedience, be the Condition of Juſtification? 3*dly*. He ſays, *Pag*: 250. *That all Acts of ſaving Faith, whether they go before or follow Juſtification, do in leſs or more influence Obedience to the whole Moral Law*. Now if he mean, That Faith that goes before Juſtification, hath an aptitudinal Influence in its Nature, to excite to Obedience, it is very true: But if he mean, That that Faith that goes before Juſtification, is followed with actual Obedience before the Man be juſtified; this I look upon as dangerous Doctine: For ſo a Man produces ſaving Obedience, becauſe he is ſuppoſed to have ſaving Faith, before he be juſtified: And ſo his Obedience being ſaving, muſt needs be accepted before his Perſon be accepted; becauſe he is ſuppoſed yet not to be juſtified.

HE ſays, *Pag*: 250. *That this is the ſame Doctrine, with that of the Apoſtle, who tells us, That ſaving Faith worketh by Love, and calls the Obedience of Believers the Obedience of Faith; and alſo it is the Doctrine taught by Mr.* Owen *upon Juſtification, Pag*: 139, 140. But 1*ſt*. The Queſtion is not, Whether ſaving Faith worketh by Love; but whether as it worketh, or only as it lays Hold on Chriſt for Righteouſneſs, it be the Condition of Juſtification? Not is the Queſtion, Whether that Faith, which is the Condition of Juſtification, is inſeparably followed with Obedience? As to which Queſtion, Profeſſor *Simſon* has not been yet pleaſed fully to explain himſelf. 2*dly*. As to the Teſti-

Testimony cited out of Dr. *Owen*, it is nothing at all to his Purpose, his Words are, *But to suppose that a dead Faith, or that Faith which is dead, is that Faith which is required of us, in the Gospel in the Way of Duty, is a monstruous Imagination*: And a little below in that same *Page*, *For how impossible is it, according to their Principles, who believe Justification by Faith alone, that justifying Faith should be without a sincere Purpose of Heart to obey GOD in all Things.* Now it is plain to any, that consider the Words, and will be at the Pains to consult the Place it self, that Dr. *Owen* there is speaking specificatively of the Faith that is justifying, in Opposition to Papists and others, who maintain a dead Faith, and proves, That it is impossible that a Faith truly saving and justifying, can be without good Works, and Obedience, which no Body doubts of: But he is not speaking there of Faith as justifying, as it goes out to Christ as a Priest, clothed with a Righteousness, whereby we stand righteous before GOD; under which Consideration Mr. *Owen* makes Faith & Faith alone the condition of our Justification.

He says in his Opinion, the only Sense in which Obedience can be said to be included in the Nature of Faith as justifying is, that it is influenced by this Faith, as a vital Principle, or is the Fruit it natively brings forth. And further he say, *The* Socinians *err*, 1st *In that they acknowledge* no *other Faith, but the Belief of the Truth of GOD's Commands, and the Promise of Pardon upon their sincere Obedience.* 2dly. *That they make Obedience to be the Essence of Faith as it justifies, or Obedience flowing from Faith, to be the Condition of Justification, and so found, That Justification*

tion on their own Works, and GOD's Acceptilation without any Regard at all to the Satisfaction of Chriſt. But 1*ſt*. Beſides the Impropriety of ſaying, *Faith* as juſtifying, includes Obedience as it influences thereto (for this is to confound Faith and its Fruits, *i.e.* Obedience or actual Holineſs) here he plainly owns, That Faith as juſtifying, *i.e.* going out to Chriſt for Juſtification, before GOD is conſidered as influencing Obedience; which is very dangerous Doctrine. Certain it is, That Faith which is juſtifying, influences Obedience: But to ſay, That Faith as it influences to Obedience juſtifieth, is a quite other Thing, and as I conceive very dangerous; for ſo Faith is not the Condition of our Juſtification only as it goes out of it ſelf, to Chriſt for Righteouſneſs, but alſo as it influences to good Works, ſo as thereby, the Conſideration or Reduplication under which it is juſtifying, is its Relation to good Works, as their vital Principle; and thereby good Work are more principally the Condition of Juſtification than Faith; becauſe according to Mr. *Simſon*, the Conſideration under which it is juſtifying, is its Relation to good Works which it influences; for *propter quod aliquid eſt tale illud ipſum eſt majus tale.* 2*dly*. Tho' he do not include Obedience in the Eſſence of Faith, as *Socinians* do; yet he makes Faith as it has Obedience for it's Object, the Prerequiſite or Condition of Juſtification; and ſo thereby includes a Reſpect to good Works, as an Ingredient in the Condition of our Juſtification. 3*dly*. Though *Socinians* found their Juſtification upon good Works without Relation to the Satisfaction of Chriſt;

yet

et he knows that Papiſts and *Arminians*, who maintain Juſtification by Works, do own a Relation to Chriſt's Satisfaction: For they ſay, That Chriſt's Satisfaction is the meritorious Cauſe of our being juſtified by our Works, or that Reſpect to Chriſt's Death is the Cauſe that GOD juſtifies as for our Works tho' imperfect. Now if Repentance be a Prerequiſite or Condition of Juſtification, I ſee not how he differs ſo very far from them; for Repentance cannot be a Condition relatively, becauſe it hath no Reſpect to an imputed Righteouſneſs as its Object: And therefore, it muſt be a Condition conſidered abſolutely as it is a Work.

HE ſays further, *Pag*: 252. *That what Mr.* Webſter *ſeems to diſlike, is ſome Thing in his Anſwer to his Queſtion at* Edinburgh, *viz. That we muſt accept of Chriſt and his Righteouſneſs for Sanctification before we be juſtified, and that alſo we muſt purpoſe and engage in the Strength of Chriſt to ſtudy ſincere Obedience to the whole Law, before we be juſtified.* Indeed I think Mr. *Webſter* had good Reaſon to diſlike this Anſwer. For, 1*ſt*. It ſeems, according to Mr. *Simſon*, That the firſt Thing a Man eyes in his receiving Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, is his receiving the Benefit of Sanctification. But I ever thought that the firſt Thing a Believer eyed in his receiving Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, is his Abſolution from the condemnatory Sentence of the Law, and his Title to eternal Life, by the Imputation of that Righteouſneſs, ſo that he perverts the natural Order. 2*dly*. He makes Faith as juſtifying to reſpect Chriſt for Sanctification; which is new kind of Doctrine:

For this is to make Sanctification, for which Faith as juſtifying lays hold upon Chriſt, the Foundation of our Juſtification before GOD even as when Faith as juſtifying, lays hold upon Chriſt for Righteouſneſs, thereby his Righteouſneſs is made the Foundation of our Juſtification. Indeed *ſaving Faith* reſpects Chriſt in all his Offices; but Faith as juſtifying reſpects Chriſt only as a Prieſt, and as clothed with a perfect Righteouſneſs, to anſwer the Demands of the Law; and theſe two ought not to be confounded when he is ſpeaking of Faith as the Condition of Juſtification; ſo that without Ground he affirms, That he aſſerts Nothing but what is contained in the *Confeſſion of Faith:* For his Doctrine is manifeſtly contrary thereto. See *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap:* 11. §. 1. *Larger Catechiſm Queſt: What is Juſtification?* And the *Leſſer Catechiſm* on that ſame *Queſt:* Where Chriſt's Righteouſneſs only is held forth, as the Object of juſtifying Faith, and Faith as juſtifying is deſcribed, as only having that Righteouſneſs for its Object, and as the alone Inſtrument of receiving that Righteouſneſs; ſo that Mr. *Simſon* contradicts the *Confeſſion* and *Catechiſm*, when he ſays, *That Faith as juſtifying reſpects Chriſt for Sanctification:* For if he do not mean of Faith as juſtifying, he does not anſwer the Queſtion in Hand fairly, which ſpeaks of Faith under that Conſideration, *viz:* as juſtifying. 3*dly.* If ſincere Engaging to Obedience go before our being pardoned or juſtified, I would know whether it be only a Precedency of natural Order; but that is impoſſible for a Man to purpoſe ſincere Obedience in a right Manner, till he be

be juſtified; or it preceeds Juſtification as the Condition thereof; but this is palpably groſs, to ſay, That engaging to Obedience, is a Condition of our Juſtification; Beſides this Purpoſe either preceeds juſtifying Faith in Order, or follows it: The firſt is impoſſible; for a Man without Faith cannot rightly engage: And Mr. *Simſon* himſelf ſays, *That this Engaging is in the Strength of Chriſt*, which ſuppoſes Faith; if this Purpoſe follow Faith then it ſeems, that Juſtification is not the firſt and immediate Effect of ſaving juſtifying Faith; for engaging to Obedience, according to Mr. *Simſon*, goes before Juſtification; and conſequently is a more immediate Effect of Faith than Juſtification, which are things ſtrange, and of dangerous Conſequence. Beſides I do not underſtand, why he ſhould make an Engagement to ſincere Obedience go before Pardon, unleſs he make it the Condition of Pardon, eſpecially ſince he makes it a Prerequiſite to Juſtification as well as Faith.

He alſo again alledges Dr. *Owen* to be of his Opinion, on Juſtification, *Pag*: 140, 141. towards the Foot, he there indeed ſays, *That it is impoſſible that juſtifying Faith ſhould be where the Mind is not prepared, diſpoſed and determined to univerſal Obedience*: Where alſo he alledges, *That Mr.* Owen *affirms, That Repentance as well as Faith, preceeds Pardon and Juſtification*: Further he affirms this Doctrine to be agreeable to the Scriptures, which teach, that Repentance unto Life preceeds Pardon and Juſtification, as *Iſa*: 55. 7. *Act*: 2. 38. & 3. 19. *Luke* 13. 3, 5. and our *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap*: 10. §. 1. And to the pa-

rallel Queſtions in the *Catechiſms* on Effectual Calling, the firſt Part of which Effectual Calling is Regeneration; the ſecond Part of it, Repentance unto Life; and the laſt Part of it, Juſtifying Faith: All which preceed Juſtification, as appears by *Chap.* 11. of the *Confeſſion of Faith* §. 1, 2. As alſo *Chap.* 15. §. 1, 2, 3. Where it is ſaid, *That Repentance is of ſuch Neceſſity to all Sinners, that without it none may expect Pardon.*

1. I wonder, how he can alledge theſe Words of Dr. *Owen* for his Purpoſe; all that Mr. *Owen* affirms, is, That it is impoſſible, that juſtifying Faith can be without a ſincere Purpoſe of obeying GOD in all things, which no Body doubts of: But he ſpeaks not a Word of this Purpoſe, being a Prerequiſite of Juſtification; yea, Mr. *Owen* makes plainly againſt him: For, 1*ſt*. He ſays, That it is Faith that gives Life and Efficacy to all other Graces, and Form unto Evangelical Obedience: And therefore Repentance does not go before juſtifying Faith, as we have ſeen Mr. *Simſon* juſt now affirming. 2*dly*. Mr. *Owen* ſays, That no other Grace is capable of that Office, which is aſſigned unto Faith, nor can be aſſumed into a Society in Operation with it: So that according to Mr. *Owen*, Faith is the only Prerequiſite to Juſtification. 3*dly*. He affirms, in the 142 *Pag.* That no Scriptures aſſign our Juſtification unto any other Grace, or all Graces together, or all the Fruits of them, ſo as it is aſſigned unto Faith. 4*ly*. He affirms this to be particularly true of Repentance, which he tells us Adverſaries vehemently urge, as of the ſame Neceſſity to our Juſtification, and tells us, The Scriptures they cite for this Pur-

Purpoſe, which are the ſame that Mr. *Simſon* adduces, as *Acts* 2. 38. & 3. 19. 5*thly*. Mr. *Owen* there ſays, That what the Adverſaries have to prove, is not, That Repentance is of the ſame Neceſſity with Faith to them that are juſtified; but that it is of the ſame Uſe with Faith in their Juſtification, where he ſpeaks not a Word of its being a Prerequiſite of Juſtification, only granting its Neceſſity to Salvation, denies that it is of the ſame Uſe with Faith in Juſtification. Now ſeing Mr. *Simſon* makes Repentance a Prerequiſite of Juſtification, I want to know, whether it be a Prerequiſite in the ſame Senſe or not? If in the ſame Senſe, this is palpably groſs, and contrary to what we juſt now cited out of Mr. *Owen*, as well as to the Scripture and *Confeſſion of Faith*, which aſſert our Juſtification by Faith alone, without Works: If it be a Prerequiſite in another Senſe than Faith is, I ſhall be glad to hear the Profeſſor explain himſelf upon this Head.

As to the Scriptures he adduces, we remark in general, That theſe Scriptures adduced by him, are the ſame that *Papiſts* and *Arminians* make Uſe of to prove Juſtification by Works, to which his Opinion of Repentance and Ingagement to Obedience, as neceſſary Prerequiſites of Juſtification, ſeems to be near of Kin. 2*dly*. As to the firſt Scripture *Iſai:* 55. 7. We anſwer, 1*ſt*. The Place ſhews what is the Duty of the Perſon, who may expect Pardon, *viz*. They that turn, but does not point out preciſely the Condition of Pardon, which we are to learn from other Scriptures. 2*dly*. The Thing required in the Text, *viz*: *Turning*, takes in not only Repentance, but Reformation of Life,

yea

yea, and Perſeverance; ſo that, according to th
Argument, Perſeverance will be a Prerequiſite
Pardon. 3*dly*. Pardon is oftentimes taken for th
Effect, *i. e.* not puniſhing, as is obvious, and ſo
ſeems to be here taken; for that is the Fruit
Pardon, and ſo Holineſs and Perſeverance are pre
requiſite Means to eſcape Damnation.

THE ſecond and third Scriptures he adduces are *Acts* 2. 38. & 3. 19. But according to hi Way of arguing, they will prove, That Repentance is the Condition of Pardon, as well a Faith, which Mr. *Simſon* may know is neither th Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, nor of th Kirk of *Scotland*. 2*dly*. He may alſo know, Tha Repentance is ſometime taken largely, as including Faith as the Principle and Spring of Repentance, *Zech:* 12. 10. *They ſhall look unto him &c.* And Repentance as the Fruit and Evidence o Faith; and that ſo it muſt be taken here is evident from the 39 *Verſ:* of that 2. of the *Acts*, Where it is ſaid, *The Promiſe is to you and your Children*. Now the Promiſes are the proper and immediate Objects not of Repentance, but of Faith; therefore Believers are ſaid to receive the Promiſe by Faith, *Rom:* 4. 16. *Heb:* 11. 13. 2*dly*. Becauſe otherwiſe it can never be reconciled with other Scriptures, where Faith alone is ſaid to be the Condition of Juſtification, as *Rom:* 3. 24, 25, 28. *Chap:* 4. *Gal:* 2. 16. *Acts* 13. 39. & 16. 31, 32. And ſo they are called to Faith, as the Condition of Pardon, and Repentance as the Fruit of it, and Mean to eſcape actual Damnation.

ACTS 3 19. Speaks of Pardon at the laſt Day, *viz.* A Publication of Pardon at that Time, and ſo

ſo not a proper Pardon; otherwiſe ſin were not pardoned till the Day of Judgment. As to *Luke* 13. 3. 5. we have already anſwered it.

HE alledges his Doctrine is taught *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap:* 10. §. 1. And in the parallel Queſtions in the *Catechiſms*, where he ſays, *Regeneration is firſt, Repentance next, and Juſtifying Faith in the laſt Place*; But, *Firſt*, Theſe Places ſpeak not a Word of Evangelical Repentance; for the Conviction of Sin and Miſery there named, goes before their Converſion, and ſo cannot be Evangelical Repentance. 2*dly*. How he gathers the foreſaid Order from theſe Places, is what I cannot ſee; for in all theſe Places, as we hinted, there is not a Word of Repentance: But 1*ſt*. Of Conviction of Sin and Miſery, which is a common Operation. 2*dly*. There is a ſaving Change upon the Powers of the Soul, *viz*. Saving Illumination in the Mind, and Renovation of the Will. 3*dly*. Thereupon there is actuating Grace enabling the Man to believe. 3*dly*. He makes Repentance to go before Juſtifying Faith, which is groſs; for if he underſtand it of legal Repentance, it is not to the Purpoſe; becauſe it is not always followed with Juſtification: If he underſtand it of Evangelical Repentance, this is contrary to the Natural Order of Things; for Saving Faith is the Spring both of Love and Repentance. And as Mr. *Owen* ſays in the forecited Place on Juſtification, *gives Life and Efficacy unto all other Graces*, and ſo to Repentance, *Zech:* 12. 10. We ſee that Goſpel Repentance flows from Faith's looks to a Crucified Chriſt, and is alſo contrary to the Order ſet down in the *Confeſſion of Faith*, where ſaving Faith is treated

of

of in the 14*th Chap.* and Repentance unto Life in the 15*th.* and to the Anſwer to the Queſtion in the Shorter *Catechiſm, What doth GOD require of us to eſcape his Wrath,* &c. Where in the Anſwer Faith is firſt required and then Repentance unto Life. As to the 11 *Chap.* of the *Confeſſion Par.* 2. we took notice of it already; as alſo of the 15*th Chap: Parag:* 2, 3. and ſhall add no more on theſe Places. Only if Mr. *Simſon* think that Repentance goes before Juſtifying Faith, becauſe Conviction of ſin and miſery goes before it in the forenamed Queſtion, he is certainly miſtaken, becauſe that is but a common Work of the Spirit, and ſo goes before the Renovation of their Natures, and therefore cannot be Goſpel Repentance.

To conclude this head, it's plain, he makes Repentance: a Prerequiſite to Juſtification: Now I wiſh he had explained what he means by a Prerequiſite, partly becauſe the Queſtion he is anſwering, ſpeaks of Faith as a Condition of Juſtification, partly becauſe by Joining, Engaging to Duty and Repentance with *juſtifying Faith,* as neceſſary Prerequiſites to Juſtification, he ſeems plainly to make them Prerequiſites of the ſame Kind with Faith; otherwiſe if he do not, he ſhifts the Queſtion, and ſpeaks not clearly to the Matter in Hand: And if ſo, I wiſh he had explained himſelf in what Senſe he makes Repentance and Engaging to Duty Prerequiſites to Juſtification; but if he make them Prerequiſites in the ſame Senſe that Faith is, then are they Conditions of Juſtification in the ſame Senſe as well as Faith is; Which is not only contrary to the Scripture, which every where Aſcribes Juſtification to Faith alone, but

but alſo to the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap.* 11. §. 1. and to the parallel Queſtions on Juſtification, where Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is ſaid to be received by Faith alone. From which the Moment and Importance of this Point appears, being about the Condition of our Juſtification; Alſo this Doctrine is refuted by Mr. *Durham* on the *Revelation*, and by Mr. *Brown* in his Book upon *Juſtification*, as alſo by Mr. *Owen Chap.* 16, 17, 18. *&c.* of that Book, and I ſuppoſe they underſtood the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches. But it were too large a Digreſſion, to enter upon a direct refuting of this Dangerous Error, which is fully done by ſo many Orthodox Divines.

CHAP. XII.

Concerning Natural Reaſon.

UPon this Head, we ſhall firſt ſet down what Profeſſor *Simſon* refuſes, and next what he owns: And, 1*ſt. Pag:* 254. he ſays, *It is utterly falſe, that in any of his Letters to the deceaſt Mr.* Rowan; he affirms, *That there are two Principles in Religion,* viz. SCRIPTURE *and our* REASON. 2*dly.* He ſays, *That taking Reaſon (as ſeveral do) for the intellectual Faculty, or its Exerciſe, or both, as Mr.* Rowan *ſeems to do in his Letter to him,* February 15. 1712. *that then he denies Reaſon to be a Principle of Divinity, which,* he ſays, *is evident from his Letter to Mr.* Rowan, November 21. 1712. Where he tells, *That by* Ratio *he underſtands Evident Propoſitions naturally revealed; and by* Principium *or* Fundamentum *the Argument*

Argument by which any Concluſion is proven to be true, which, he ſays, *is the juſt Meaning of theſe Terms in this Caſe, when the Queſtion is, upon what Arguments is Theology founded or proved to be true?*

AND ſo, 3*dly*. He ſays, *That he does not allow our Reaſon, taking it for our Intellectual Faculty, or its Exerciſe, to be ſo much as an Argument of Theology*; And tells us, *That in his Letter to Mr.* Rowan May 1. 1712. *That he affirms that if* Ratio *be taken ſo, he thinks, that Propoſition* (*namely,* Ratio eſt ultimum Principium Theologiæ) *together with the two Inferences drawn from it, with the Propoſitions of* Smalcius *and* Oſtorodius, *to be all ſtark Nonſenſe.*

4. HE owns, *That the ultimate Proof of Theology is made up of evident Propoſitions naturally revealed, and challenges any Perſon to prove this to be falſe or contrary to the Scripture, or to our* Confeſſion *and* Catechiſms.

5. HE ſays, *That if Mr.* Webſter *mean by Reaſon what he means* (i. e. *Evident Propoſitions naturally revealed*) *and if he take Theology in its full Extent, as it comprehends both natural and revealed Religion, that then there is a twofold Principle of Theology,* viz. *Scripture and Reaſon, taking* Principle *for a Rule*: *And this,* he ſays, *every Undergraduate* (*who has learned his* Pneumaticks *and* Ethicks, *and is not an* Ignoramus) *doth know.*

6. WE ſhall alſo, for ſetting what he maintains on this Head in a fuller Light, take Notice of what he affirms in his ſecond Letter to Mr. *Rowan*: And 1*ſt*. HE ſays, *That by* Reaſon, *he underſtands Evident Propoſitions naturally revealed*; *and by* Principium *or* Fundamentum *the Argument by which any Conclu-*

Concluſion is proved; Which, he ſays, *is the juſt Meaning of the Queſtion, Upon what Argument is Theology founded or proved to be true?* 2*dly.* He joyns to the mentioned Propoſition (*Verbum DEI non eſt ſolum Principium Theologiæ, Ratio humana eſt etiam Principium et ultimum Fundamentum ejus*) *That the Scriptures are the immediate Fundation of revealed Religion, and the perfect Rule of Faith and Manners, which are to be believed and obeyed, becauſe the Word of GOD,* &c. 3*dly.* He ſays, *That this agrees very well with what he teaches,* viz. Ratio ut ſumitur pro evidentibus Propoſitionibus, naturaliter revelatis, eſt Principium ſeu Fundamentum Theologiæ, quatenus Argumentum quo probatur DEI Exiſtentia et Scripturarum divina Authoritas: His Reaſon is, *Becauſe tho' the Scriptures are to be believed, only becauſe the Word of GOD, yet none is obliged to believe them to be GOD's Word without Proof*: For which he makes Uſe of this Syllogiſm, *What GOD ſays is true*; But, *GOD ſays this*: Ergo. And ſo affirms, *That Reaſon in this Senſe being the proper and ultimate Proof by which we know every Revelation of GOD to be his, to be truly and properly ſaid to be the* Principium ultimum Theologiæ: *Which,* he ſays, *is neither new nor erronious Doctrine, altho' it contradicts in Terms ſome unwary Expreſſions of* Marckius *and others; but agrees with what they teach elſewhere* de Articulis præſuppoſitis, &c. Further, 4*thly.* In the 4. *Pag:* of the foreſaid ſecond Letter, he owns, *The two Inferences drawn by Mr.* Rowan *from this Propoſition, charged on him by Mr.* Rowan, *viz.* Verbum DEI non eſt ſolum Principium Theologiæ, Ratio humana eſt etiam Principium, et ultimum Fundamentum

mentum Theologiæ, *which Mr.* Rowan *ſays is contrary to the* Confeſſion *Chap:* 1. §. 4. The firſt Inference he draws, is, *That it follows, that Reaſon hath an Equality with Scripture Authority in Principles of Faith, and determining Controverſies.* To this Mr. *Simſon* anſwers, *That this Inference is very true, and a Propoſition taught by all (taking Reaſon for evident Propoſitions naturally revealed) His Reaſon is, becauſe evident Truths, neither do, nor can contradict the Scripture, nor the Scripture them.* The ſecond Inference, viz. *That Nothing is to be admitted in Religion, but what is agreeable to Reaſon, and determined by Reaſon to be ſo: He thinks to be true; becauſe it is only by Reaſon in his Senſe, that ſome Controverſies can be determined, as theſe betwixt us and Atheiſts,* &c. *5thly.* He ſays, *That* Turrettine *on this Queſtion only quibbles, and that even the two Propoſitions cited by him out of* Oſtorodius *and* Smalcius *are true.*

WE ſhall next make ſome Reflections upon this Doctrine he delivers, *1ſt.* I wonder how he denies, that any where he affirms, That there are two Principles of Theology, *viz.* Scripture and Reaſon, when he affirms this very Thing expreſly in the 256. *Pag:* of his Anſwers, as we juſt now cited his Words: As alſo in his ſecond Letter to Mr. *Rowan Pag:* 4. 5. where he owns the two Inferences drawn from that Propoſition, *viz. Verbum Dei non eſt ſolum principium Theologiæ, Ratio humana eſt etiam principium et ultimum Fundamentum ejus.* Now if the Propoſition be falſe, and he diſown it; it's ſtrange how he ſhould own the two Inferences, drawn therefrom as true: Indeed he never calls Reaſon *Ratio Humana*, but *Ratio* ſimply, but this is only

Trifling

Trifling; for certainly evident Propoſitions naturally revealed, are *ratio Humana*, not *Angelica*: Beſides, he owns in his ſecond Letter to Mr. *Rowan*, That *Ratio ut ſumitur pro evidentibus Propoſitionibus naturaliter revelatis, eſt Principium et Fundamentum Theologiæ*, and in the 256 *Pag:* of his Anſwers, he affirms, That the ultimate Proof of Theology is made up of evident Propoſitions naturally revealed.

2. IT is to little Purpoſe, when he ſays, he denies Reaſon when taken for the Rational Faculty and the Exerciſe thereof, or both, to be either a Principle or Argument in Divinity, and that Mr. *Rowan* did ſo underſtand the Term *Reaſon*; for there is nothing in Mr. *Rowan*'s Letter to give Ground to think he ſo underſtood it; it's plain he underſtood not only the rational Faculty and Exerciſe thereof, but Mr. *Simſon*'s evident Propoſitions, which laſt, as I ſuppoſe, is the Ordinary Meaning of the Word, *Reaſon*; and I ſuppoſe *Socinians* take Reaſon in this Senſe, and that our Divines do impugn its being a Principle of Theology in the ſame Senſe, if we will allow them to underſtand that Controverſy, unleſs we think they quibble as *Turretin* does. Let any read *Hornbeck*, and they will ſee he takes Reaſon in Mr. *Simſon*'s Senſe:

3. HE confounds the Principle of Theology with the Argument or *Medium Probationis*; for a Thing may be a Mean of Probation, which is not the Principle or Foundation upon which the Truth it ſelf, or my Aſſent to it, are built; as is plain to any that will read that *Queſtion* in *Turretin*. Propoſitions naturally evident may

ſtand

ſtand in a Subordination to help one to take up ſome Scripture Truths, yet his Faith to theſe Truths, is only built upon Scripture Revelation, or Divine Authority, and not upon the Clearneſs of the Propoſitions; otherwiſe his Aſſent to theſe Truths is no more Faith, but what Philoſophers call *Scientia* or *Demonſtratio*, and ſuppoſing a learned Man to believe the Chriſtian Religion upon meer rational Grounds, his Aſſent to the Chriſtian Religion is not Faith, but a pure rational Aſſent.

4. HE ſays that taking Reaſon for the rational Faculty and Exerciſe thereof, *&c.* he allows it not to be ſo much as an Argument, far leſs a Rule in Divinity: It ſeems then according to him, that Reaſon taken for evident Propoſitions, is not only an Argument of Proof in Divinity, but alſo a Rule, which ſeems to be a ſecond Senſe, in which he affirms Reaſon to be the Principle and Foundation of Religion. 2*dly*, Are not evident Propoſitions a part of the rational Faculties Exerciſe; but it ſeems by Reaſon he underſtands the Objects or Truths themſelves, but this is not Material; for theſe Propoſitions may take in both the Act and the Object. 3*dly*. Taking Reaſon for the rational Faculty and Exerciſe thereof, I ſuppoſe is not ſo great Nonſenſe (I do not ſay it is not an Error) to ſay that *Ratio* is *ultimum Principium Theologiæ*; for any Perſon may know that *Ratio* or Reaſon taken for the rational Faculty, may be ſaid to be the Principle of Religion, as the rational Powers chiefly diſcern, judge of, and determine concerning Scripture Truths, which it is certain, the *Socinians* affirm, which is a dangerous Error. For it is

Faith

Faith that takes up, discerns and judges of Scripture Truths, and that not by the Light of evident Propositions naturally Revealed, but by the native Light of the Scriptures themselves, and by comparing one Scripture with another, as is clear from *Heb.* 11. 1, 2. Where tho' it may be known by Reason that the World had a Beginning, and was made of Nothing, yet the Apostle founds our Faith of it entirely upon the Word of GOD.

WE would notice two things, 1*st*. That Reason, according to the *Socinians*, is said to be the Principle of Religion, 1*st*. In regard of the rational Faculty, as it judgeth and determines concerning Scripture Truths. 2*dly*. In regard of clear and self Evident Propositions, which are the Standard, by Conformity to which the rational Faculty judgeth of Points of Theology, and so in Opposition to the twofold Foundation in Religion, *viz*. one Personal, the Lord Jesus, they substitute Man's rational Faculty or Man himself, and in Opposition to the *Fundamentum Normale*, *viz*. the Scriptures, they place Propositions evident and naturally Revealed.

2. WE would Notice, That Reason hath a threefold use in the Point of Religion, 1*st*. Simply to understand Scripture Truths, and to judge of them by comparing one Truth with another, and of the Connection of Scripture Truths, yet still as Sanctified by Faith, and keeping to the Standard of the Word. 2*dly*. To draw Arguments from Scripture it self. 3*dly*: Sometimes to confirm Scripture Truths by rational Arguments; Now such Arguments are only Auxiliary and Subservient, not a Rule or Foundation of our Belief,

lief, otherwiſe our Belief is not Faith, but *Scientia* or *Demonſtratio*, ſuch Arguments are like the *Samaritan* Woman her Teſtimony concerning Chriſt, to her Fellow Citizens, *Joh*: 4. For they tell her, *Now we believe not becauſe of thy Word*, &c. And like a Man's believing the Scriptures, 1*ſt*. Becauſe of the Teſtimony of the Church; but afterwards when he comes to underſtand the Scriptures, he believes them for themſelves. 5*thly* He ſays, *pag*: 256 *The ultimate Proof of Theology is made up of evident Propoſitions naturally revealed*. But, 1*ſt*. This ſeems to be a ſtrange and bold Aſſertion: For he not only challenges Mr. *Webſter*, but all that will take his Part, to prove this to be contrary to Scripture, or *Confeſſion of Faith*. He puts me in Mind of the Boaſting of the Giant *Goliath*, and he ſeems to talk in the proud Dialect of *Socinus*. 2*dly*. If ſuch Propoſitions be the ultimate Proof of Theology, then they are the greateſt Proof of Theology; ſo that the Scriptures are not the ultimate Proof of Theology, becauſe there cannot be two ultimate Proofs thereof, which ſeems very groſs. 3*dly*. Scripture Proof is either ſubordinate to the Proof by theſe evident Propoſitions; or a Proof by theſe Propoſitions is ſubordinate to the Scripture; or they are coordinate: The laſt cannot be; for ſo Reaſon is not the ultimate Proof; becauſe, as we have ſaid, there cannot be two ultimate Proofs: Beſides, that he himſelf calls Reaſon the ultimate Proof, and ſays, That we cannot prove the Scriptures againſt Atheiſts but by Reaſon. Nor can it be the firſt; for it is palpably groſs to ſay, That Scripture Proof is ſubordinate to natural Reaſon; for ſo the Proof

Proof by ſuch Propoſitions were a greater and ſtronger Proof than the Scripture Proof; becauſe the ſubordinate Proof is ſtill leſſer than the ultimate; and therefore the ſecond muſt be the Truth. 4*ly.* If the ultimate Proof of Theology be reſolved into ſuch Propoſitions, then our Faith in Articles of Religion is ultimately reſolved into, and founded upon Reaſon, *i. e.* ſuch Propoſitions; for what is the ultimate Proof of the Articles themſelves muſt be the ultimate *Baſis* of my Faith, or Aſſent to them; becauſe Faith is chiefly bottom'd on what is the ultimate Proof of theſe Things; for both the Doctrines, and our Aſſent to them have the ſame Bottom. But this is very harſh; for this deſtroys the Scriptures, being the ultimate *Baſis* of Faith, which ultimately reſolves, and leans on the Authority of divine Revelation, and not on clear and evident Propoſitions of natural Reaſon. 5*ly.* This reſolves the Faith of the Articles of Religion into a meer rational Aſſent; for our Aſſent to Truths muſt be of the ſame Nature with the Proofs, upon which our Aſſent to them ultimately leans; and therefore, if the ultimate Proof of Theology be ſuch evident Propoſitions our Aſſent to theſe Truths is at length reſolved into ſuch Propoſitions: Now theſe Propoſitions being Truths, evident by the meer Light of Nature cannot found Faith, but a meer rational Aſſent; for the Aſſent is ſtill of the ſame Nature with the Proof upon which it ultimately leans. 6*ly.* I would know if Reaſon in his Senſe be the ultimate Proof of all Points in Theology, or of ſome only: If the laſt, then all the Articles of Theology have not the ſame ultimate Proof, and

ſo are not founded upon the ſame Bottom, but ſome of them lean upon Scripture, others upon Reaſon, which is to make Religion partly made up of Faith, partly of natural Reaſon; ſo that there by the Scriptures will be only a partial Rule of Proof. If it be the ultimate Proof of all Points of Theology, then the ultimate Proof of the Myſtery of the Trinity, Chriſt's Incarnation, the Imputation of his Righteouſneſs, &c. And ſo our Aſſent to theſe Articles is finally and ultimately reſolved into natural Reaſon, *i. e.* our Aſſent to theſe evident Propoſitions. *7thly.* What is the ultimate Proof of Theology, is the ultimate Rule thereof; for the ultimate Proof is ſtill the Standard and Square, by which our Aſſent to the Truths that lean upon ſuch an ultimate Proof, is to be regulate; So that according to him, Reaſon is the ultimate Rule in Divinity. *8thly.* If Reaſon in his Senſe, *i. e.* theſe evident Propoſitions be the ultimate Proof in Theology, then all its Myſteries can be deduced from, and proven by Reaſon; as all Concluſions in *Sciences* are proven and deduced from their firſt Principles and *Axiomata.* *9thly.* It would ſeem by this, That Men need no Illumination, but only the right Uſe of theſe evident Propoſitions, to take up and believe the Myſteries of the Scripture: For if Men can without any ſpecial Illumination, take up and believe the ultimate Proof of the Points of Theology, they can alſo the ſame Way take up and believe theſe Articles, of which theſe evident Propoſitions are the ultimate Proof; for there is a pretty near Affinity betwixt theſe two Points; they who maintain Reaſon to be the Rule and Principle in Religion

ligion

gion, do alſo deny the Neceſſity of any ſupernatu-al Revelation, to take up the Scriptures. 10*ly*. This is contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap*: 1. §. 4. Where it is ſaid, *That the Authority of the Scriptures, for which they ought to be believed and obeyed, depen-deth not upon the Teſtimony of any Man*, &c. *and there ore are to be received becauſe they are the Word of GOD*; as alſo the 10 §. of that Chapter, where *the Supream Judge of all Controverſies of Religion*, is ſaid to *be only the Holy Spirit ſpeaking in the Word*. Now if his evident Propoſitions be the ultimate Proof of Theology, then they are the chief and principal Motive of believing the Scriptures to be the Word of GOD; becauſe what is the ultimate Proof of the Truth of a Thing, is alſo the chief and principal Motive of my Aſſent to it: So that, according to Mr. *Simſon*, the chief and principal Motive of my Aſſent to the Scriptures, as the Word of GOD, is not the Divine Authority ſhining in them, but theſe evident Propoſitions, which, according to Mr. *Simſon*, are the ultimate Proof of the Authority of the Scriptures; which is to ſay, That the Scriptures are not to be believed for themſelves, or for their own Authority; but becauſe of theſe evident Propoſitions, which are the ultimate Proof of the Authority of the Scrip-tures; which if it do not flatly contradict the fore-ſaid *Paragraph*, we leave it to any to judge.

6. HE ſays, *Page* 256. That taking *Reaſon*, as he takes it, for theſe evident *Propoſitions*, and *Theo-logy* as comprehending *Natural* and *Revealed Theo-logy*; that then there is a twofold Principle of *Theo-logy*, *viz*. Scripture and Reaſon. And he ſays, That he takes *Principle* here for a Rule.

Now it is plain, That he makes *Reaſon i. e.* his evident Propoſitions, not only the ultimate Proof, but alſo a Rule of *Theology*, which I would think to be groſs enough. 2*dly*. Then the Scriptures are neither the perfect, nor the only Rule of Divinity, if Reaſon be alſo a Rule; can there be any Thing groſſer? for it reflects upon the Perfection of the Scripture, and is plainly contrary to the Larger and Shorter *Catechiſms*, where the Scriptures are ſaid to be the only Rule of Faith and Obedience. 3*dly*. If it be a Rule of *Theology*, as well as the Scriptures, it muſt be of equal Authority with the Scriptures, otherwiſe it is not properly a Rule; This Mr. *Simſon* expreſly owns in his ſecond Letter to Mr. *Rowan Page* 4. as we cited, and thinks it a true Propoſition that is taught by all, *viz*. That Reaſon (*i. e.* his evident Propoſitions, *&c.*) hath an equal Authority with the Scriptures in Matters of Faith, and determining Controverſies. But what can be more groſs. For, 1*ſt*. This is to make the Scripture only a partial Rule. 2*dly*. This is to equal our own Reaſon with the Word of GOD, and ſo this tends to cheriſh Mens Natural Pride. 3*dly*. This is to make the Doctrine of the Apoſtles only a partial Foundation of our Faith; for if Reaſon be a Rule, it muſt alſo be a Foundation of our Faith, which is contrary to *Eph*: 2. 20. *And are built, &c*. But it ſeems, according to Mr. *Simſon*'s Doctrine, That Believers are in part built upon theſe evident Propoſitions, *i. e. Natural Reaſon*.

4. IF Reaſon in his Senſe be a Rule of Religion or *Theology*, then it muſt be the Object of Faith

Faith, the Mean of begetting Faith, and the Ground of it; but that cannot be. For, 1*ſt*. Reaſon *i. e.* ſuch Propoſitions cannot be the Object of a Divine Faith, becauſe that hath for its Object a Divine Authority and Supernatural Revelation; but ſuch evident Propoſitions are only a Natural Revelation, and ſo are not the Object of Faith, but what we call Reaſon: For Faith is properly to believe a Thing upon a Divine Teſtimony. 2*dly*. It is the Word, not Reaſon in his Senſe, that is the mean of Regeneration and Saving Faith, ſee *Rom*: 10. 14. *Jam*: 1. 18. 1 *Pet*: 1. 23. But it ſeems, according to Mr. *Simſon*, that his evident Propoſitions are alſo the Means of Regeneration and Faith, which I would think a harſh Way of ſpeaking. This kind of Mean of Faith, *viz*. his evident Propoſitions *Paul* ſhunned when he was Preaching to the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor*: 1. and 2 *Chap*: He did not go about, in order to bring them to believe the Goſpel, to prove the Truth thereof by Mr. *Simſon*'s Evident Propoſitions, ſuch as *Logical*, *Metaphyſical*, or *Mathematical Axioms*; this he ſhunned as well as the Wiſdom or Learning of Words. Nor, 3*dly*. Can Reaſon in his Senſe be the Foundation and *Baſis* of Faith, as is plain from *Pſal*: 119. 49. *Eph*: 2. 20. For nothing can found Faith, but the Revealed Word, and a Divine Authority ſhining therein; becauſe Faith, being a ſupernatural Thing, muſt have a ſupernatural Revelation as the Foundation thereof. Reaſon in his Senſe may be the foundation of Natural Theology, not of Faith. 5*thly*. If Reaſon in his Senſe be a Rule of Theology, then I would know, where theſe Propoſitions are to

be

be found; for they muſt either be found without us, as in a Syſtem, *viz.* In the Books of Philoſophers, and the like, even as Scriptural Truths are found compacted in the Bible; for if Reaſon in his Senſe be a Rule, it muſt be of the ſame Kind with the Bible; becauſe the ſubject Matter requires that it be a Rule external, and to be found in ſome Book, as Scripture Truths are to be found. And if ſo, then the compleat Rule of Theology is made up of the Bible, and evident Propoſitions, ſcattered here and there in the Writings of Philoſophers, and others, which a Perſon would think pretty near to the *Popiſh* Doctrine of the Scriptures and Tradition, making up the compleat Rule of Faith. Or theſe evident Propoſitions of his, are within us in our Mind; and if ſo, then the Rule of Theology is made up of a Rule without us, *viz.* the Word, and a Rule within us, *viz.* Natural Reaſon, which looks a little toward *Quakeriſm*, for *Socinianus eſt Doctus Tremulus, et Tremulus eſt Indoctus Socinianus.* *6thly.* If Reaſon in his Senſe be the Rule of Religion, then it is ſuch either, as it is pure, conſidered in it ſelf; but Reaſon in this Senſe is to be found no where among Men, or as it is Subjectively in us; but this Way it is very corrupt, and like a Spark covered with Aſhes: Yea, there is hardly one evident Propoſition that ſome Men of Smartneſs and Learning have not oppoſed, with a ſeeming Probability of Reaſon, as well as the Scriptures. *7thly.* I would know, how we ſhall know theſe ſelf evident Propoſitions, if it be by a further Proof, then are they not the laſt ultimate Proof of Theology, as he Aſſerts, nor ſelf-evident if they be known by

by their Native Clearneſs, why is not the ſame allowed to the Scriptures to be known by their Intrinſick Marks and Native Clearneſs, and what need is there to go to Reaſon or his evident Propoſitions, as the ultimate Proof of Theology, and of the Divine Authority of the Scriptures? For otherwiſe Reaſon has the Advantage of Scripture as a Rule; for Reaſon is known by its Native Clearneſs; Whereas, according to Mr. *Simſon*, the Scriptures cannot be proven to be the Word of GOD, but by their ultimate Proof, *viz.*: Natural Reaſon. 8*thly*. To make Reaſon a Rule, and of equal Authority with the Scripture, is to advance our Reaſon unto an equal Honour with the Authority of GOD ſpeaking in his Word, which is groſs; for Reaſon is but ſinful Man's Teſtimony, but the Word is the Teſtimony of GOD himſelf: True it is, that evident Propoſitions that are ſuch, are no leſs true than the Word; but they are not therefore of equal Authority with the Word; becauſe we have no where any external Inſtrument left us by GOD, containing theſe evident Propoſitions, as the Scripture is an external Inſtrument, Divinely inſpired, containing a Syſteme of Infallible Truths; Now theſe evident Propoſitions are no where but as they exiſt in us Subjectively, whoſe Natures are corrupted by ſin, by Reaſon of which we know but few of theſe Propoſitions, and many times abuſe theſe Propoſitions by drawing wrong Inferences: Beſides what is judged by one to be an evident Propoſition, hath been many a Time contradicted by others; ſo that we want a Standard to determine what are evident Propoſitions; Whereas the Scripture

is

is an infallible Standard to determine all Articles of Religion. *9thly.* Then the Heathens have a part of the Rule of Theology among them; and conſequently may come to be Regenerate, and believe by vertue of his evident Propoſitions, which are the ultimate Proof of Divinity; for every Part of the Rule of Religion, may be a Mean of Regeneration and Faith, even as every Part of the Scripture is uſeful for Reproof, Correction, &c. (and by the way we may obſerve the Connection of this dangerous Doctrine with what he delivers in his Anſwers to the firſt Article.) *10ly.* Then alſo Men of the quickeſt Reaſon and Apprehenſion would be the ſoundeſt in the Faith; becauſe they underſtand very well Mr. *Simſon*'s evident Propoſitions, and are moſt capable to perceive the Connection of Scripture Truths, and their Dependence on Mr. *Simſon*'s evident Propoſitions; but this has been ſo far from being true, that oftimes Men of the quickeſt Reaſon, have improven theſe evident Propoſitions, as ſtrong Arguments againſt the Chriſtian Faith, as the Heathen Philoſophers of old, and the *Socinians* of late, which by the By is a ſtrong Argument to ſhew how little Streſs is to be laid upon theſe evident Propoſitions; for, as Mr. *Simſon* thinks them the ſtrong and laſt Proof of Scripture Truths, ſo *Socinians* and Atheiſts think them ſtrong Arguments againſt them.

11 IF Reaſon in his Senſe be a Rule, then it is either a Rule of natural Theology only, or of revealled Religion alſo: It the firſt, it is not to the Purpoſe; for he knows, That the Queſtion is concerning the Chriſtian Religion as revealed in the Scrip-

Scriptures: As for natural Religion, we ſee, how little they knew, and practiſed far leſs; notwithſtanding of that Rule, *viz.* evident Propoſitions, *&c.* ſee *Rom*: 1. 20, 21. &c. 1. *Cor*: 1. 21. If it be the Rule of revealed Religion alſo, then this is not only contrary to the *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſms*, which make the Scriptures the only Rule, but alſo to the Scriptures, which every where ſend us to the Word, as a ſure and only Rule, *Iſ* 8. 20. *Jo*: 5. 39. 2 *Pet*: 1. 19. Beſides, that this makes the Scriptures a partial Rule only.

12. IF Reaſon in his Senſe be a Principle and Rule of Theology, then it's either an external or internal Principle: If the firſt, I want to know in what Book or Syſteme it's to be found: If the ſecond, then we have a Part of the Rule of Faith within us; and ſo the Rule of Religion, by which we are to judge of all Controverſies is partly within us, and partly without us.

13. IN the next place it follows, If Reaſon be the Principle and Rule of Religion, that nothing is to be admitted in Religion, but as agreeable to Reaſon, and determined by Reaſon to be ſo; this Inference he alſo flatly owns in his ſecond Letter to Mr. *Rowan*, which I would think groſs enough; indeed, nothing in Religion is to be admitted that is contrary to ſound Reaſon: But it is a different thing to ſay ſimply, That nothing can be a part of Religion that is contrary to ſound Reaſon, and that nothing is to be admitted as a part of Religion, but as agreeable to Reaſon, and determined by it to be ſo: The firſt ſhews only the ſimple Connection betwixt Religion and ſound Reaſon; but the

the laſt makes ſound Reaſon the *Norma* and the Rule by and according to which we are to Judge of Articles of Religion, and ſo ſubjects the Doctrine of Faith to Reaſon, which I would think is plain *Socinian* Doctrine. Articles of Religion may be above our Reaſon, though they be never indeed contrary to ſound Reaſon; and beſides, to make Reaſon the Principle and Rule, by which all Controverſies are to be determined, tho' in a Conjunction with the Scriptures, is to found a Man's Faith upon ſome thing within himſelf, and to make ſome thing within himſelf the Rule and Judge, by which Controverſies in Religion are to be determined, which, I would think, looks either like *Socinian* or *Quakers* Doctrine: Further I would know, when there ſeems to be a Contradiction between the Scriptures and Reaſon, which of them we are to endeavour to reconcile one to another, and to make the Rule, by which we are to underſtand the other, and ſo which of them we are to ſubject to the other, whether Reaſon to Scripture, or Scripture to Reaſon: If the laſt, then Reaſon is a Superior Rule to Scripture, which is groſs enough; for ſo the Scripture is not *Regula Regulans*, but *Regulata*; if the firſt, then Reaſon is not properly a Rule or Principle at all, as is plain, but only at beſt *Regula Regulata*; to ſay they are Co-ordinate, when a Contradiction appears betwixt them, beſides that this way the Authority of Reaſon is ſet upon a Level with the Scriptures, it will be impoſſible to take off the Contradiction, ſeing their Authority is equal, and the one not ſubject to the other.

14. LASTLY, To conclude, to make Reaſon a Rule in Religion, is plainly contrar to the 1 *Chap:* of

of the *Confession of Faith*, § 9. where the infallible Rule of Interpretation of Scripture is said to be the Scripture it self, and that when there is a Question about the true and full Sense of any Scripture, it must be searched and known by other places, that speak more clearly; where the *Confession* refers us not to Reason as a Rule of Expounding the Scripture, but to the Scriptures themselves; it is also plain from the following 10 § of that *Chap.* where the Spirit only is said to be the Supreme Judge by which all Controveries in Religion are to be determined. Now, as the Holy Spirit is the Judge speakingin the Scripture, and determining Controversies; So if Reason in Mr. *Simson's* Sense be a Rule of equal Authority with the Scriptures, then the Spirit is in an equal Measure and Degree in Reason or his evident Propositions, as in the Scriptures; and so Reason is equally inspired by the Spirit, as the Scriptures, which I would think gross enough. *Lastly*, It is plainly contrary to the second Question of the *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms*, where the Scriptures are said to be the only Rule; but, according to Mr. *Simson*, the Scriptures are not the only Rule; for he tells in the 256 *Pag.* of his Answers, *That there is a twofold Principle and Rule of Religion.*

IN his second Letter to Mr. *Rowan pag*: 4. he grants that the Scriptures are to be believed only because the Word of GOD; but yet says, None can ever be obliged to believe them to be the Word of GOD, without Proof. Now this I cannot understand, or well reconcile to it self: For if they be to be believ'd because the Word of GOD, then they cannot be believed

ved to be ſo, becauſe of the Proof; ſo as my Aſſent terminates upon the Proof, becauſe in that Caſe I do not believe them to be the Word of GOD for themſelves, but becauſe of the ſuppoſed Proof: Beſides, I would know, whether that Proof be taken from Scripture, or from Reaſon? If the firſt, then they are to be believ'd to be the Word of GOD, for themſelves intirely. If the Proof be brought from Reaſon, then the Scriptures are not only to be believ'd, becauſe they are the Word of GOD, but ultimately and chiefly, becauſe natural Reaſon proves them to be the Word of GOD: So that the Belief of the Scriptures being the Word of GOD, mainly turns upon the Hinge of natural Reaſon. Again in that *4th. pag*: Letter *2d. He ſays*, That in this Syllogiſm, *viz.* What GOD ſaith is true. *But*, GOD ſays this, *Ergo*, *&c.* The *Minor* aſſerts a Matter of Fact that muſt be proved by Arguments of natural Revelation, whether we ſpeak of the Scriptures, or of any other ſupernatural Revelation: And ſo ſays, That Reaſon in this Senſe, being the proper and ultimate Proof, by which we know every Revelation of GOD to be his, it is truly and properly ſaid to be the *Principium ultimum Theologiæ*. Now this I cannot well underſtand: For *1ſt*. Let his Minor be applied to particular Articles of Religion, and we will ſee whether it tends, *E. G.* What GOD ſays, is true. *But* GOD ſays, There are three Perſons in the GOD-Head. *Item*, GOD ſays, Chriſt is GOD-Man. Again, GOD ſays, We are ſaved by an imputed Righteouſneſs, *&c.* Now the *Minor* aſſerting a Matter of Fact, according to Mr. *Simſon*, muſt be proved by Arguments of natural

tural Revelation (and this he extends to every ſupernatural Revelation) I would know, by what Arguments of natural Revelation he would prove the foreſaid Myſteries. May not any ſee, whither his Doctrine leads? *2dly.* If Reaſon may be ſaid truly to be the *ultimum Principium Theologiæ*? Then *1ſt.* The Scriptures are not the ultimate Principle. *2dly.* Then Reaſon is a Principle ſuperior to Scripture. *3dly.* This is to reſolve all Matters of Faith into natural Reaſon, as their ultimate Principle, upon which they are grafted as a Root; a Perſon would think theſe Things hard Meat to chew.

IN the *5th, pag:* of that ſecond *Letter* he affirms, That by Reaſon in his Senſe, ſome Controverſies can only be determined, as theſe between us and *Atheiſts*, *Deiſts*, *Mahometans*, and *Pagans*. As for Example, the Truth of the Being of GOD can only be demonſtrated againſt an Atheiſt by natural Reaſon; the Truth of ſupernatural Revelation againſt *Deiſts*, can only be proven according to him by Arguments taken from natural Reaſon; and ſo the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion againſt *Mahometans* and *Pagans*, can only the ſame Way be proven againſt them. *1ſt.* I remark, That this ſeems not a little to reflect againſt the Perfection and Sufficiency of the Scriptures, as if they were not ſufficient in themſelves to convince the foreſaid Perſons: For, according to Mr. *Simſon*, natural Reaſon is the only Argument by which we can deal ſucceſsfully with them, ſo as to convince them. *2dly.* It ſeems *Paul* took not the beſt and moſt ſucceſsful Way when he was preaching the Goſ-

pel

pel to the *Pagans* to perswade them. For had he followed Mr. *Simson*'s Way, he had first gone upon his evident Propositions, and Demonstrations of natural Reason, as the most effectual Way to proselyte them; but he falls immediately upon the Preaching of the Gospel, and a crucified Christ to them, as he himself tells us in his 1. and 2. *Chapters* to the *Cor.* 3*dly*. I deny not but that it is an useful Expedient in dealing with Deists and others that deny the Scriptures and the Christian Religion, to make use of rational Arguments, and Arguments drawn from Matter of Fact, to prove the Truth of the Scriptures and Christian Religion, and that they have a Subserviency to bring them to the Faith. But, 1*st*. We are to distinguish betwixt such Proofs as are the proper Foundation of Faith; and such Proofs as only found a rational Assent; Proofs drawn from Reason to prove the Truth of the Scriptures may found a rational Assent; But it is only Arguments drawn from the Scriptures themselves that can found a Divine Faith, because Faith in its Nature respects a Divine Revelation as the Foundation of it. 2*dly*. We would notice, That when we speak of the ultimate Proof of the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, we speak, 1*st*. Of such a Proof as is the Foundation of Faith. 2*dly*. Of such a Proof as is the ultimate Proof of the same Kind: Now Arguments drawn from natural Reason can never be such a Proof, which is a Foundation of Faith; because Faith is an Assent to a Truth given upon the Authority of a Divine Revelation; and consequently cannot be an ultimate Proof: Because, as we hinted, it can never

ver found an Aſſent of Faith, but only a rational Aſſent, and at beſt is but a ſubſervient Proof. *3dly.* We would remark, tho' we are very far from condemning making uſe of rational Arguments againſt ſuch as deny the Scriptures and the Chriſtian Religion; Yet we conceive, that when Men deal with ſuch only or principally by ſuch Arguments that it has not been the moſt ſucceſsful Way of gaining ſuch: For where ſuch are Men of Wit they will not want apparently ſtrong Arguments drawn from the very ſame evident Propoſitions upon which Mr. *Simſon* lays ſo great Weight, as we may ſee even in the Controverſies with *Socinians*; for while Men are dealt with, by meer Reaſon in Divine Matters the others will not want plauſible Reaſons alſo, wherewith to defend themſelves: For Reaſon, however true and clear, yet never hath that Force to convince an Adverſary, as Arguments drawn from the Scriptures themſelves; which as it were contain in them ſomething of the Power and Authority of the Spirit, by which they have a greater Force upon the Conſcience, than any rational Argument can have; hence *Paul* ſays 1 *Cor:* 2. 4. *That his preaching was not with enticing Words of Man's Wiſdom*, which ſeems to be Mr. *Simſon's* Way, *but in the Demonſtration of the Spirit, and of Power.* *4thly.* We would notice, That Scripture Marks and Scripture Arguments when clearly produced, and when gravely urged and applied, have not only a greater Clearneſs; but alſo a greater Force to aw, and convince the Conſcience of the Truth of Religion, than any bare rational Arguments can have: As frequent Experience has

has proven; for was it not this very Way that the Apostles converted the Pagan World: So in short, in proving the Scriptures to be the Word of GOD by such Proofs, as found and beget a Divine Faith, the ultimate Proof is drawn from the Scriptures themselves, and in that Kind, we can go no further; and these, when rightly made use of, have a greater Influence to convince by their native Light and Majesty, and to beget the Faith of the Authority of the Scriptures, than any thing that is to be found in his evident Propositions: As is plain from *Confession of Faith, Chap:* 1. §. 5. Where the only Proofs of the Authority of the Scriptures, are drawn from the Scriptures themselves, although we deny not but rational Arguments may be made use of as Auxiliaries, and to prepare Men for a Divine Faith. I would think that the Characters of a Divine Authority in the Scripture, shine as bright, as any of his evident Propositions, though natural Men by Reason of their Corruption and Blindness, either will not or cannot see them, 1 *Cor:* 2. 14. But this does not reflect upon the Clearness of the Object, but the Blindness of the Eye.

To which I shall subjoin a Testimony out of the first Volume of the Reverend Principal *Wishart*, his Sermons, *pag:* 62. Where in his third Direction, *To be setled in the Faith of a DEITY*, he hath these Words, *It's not enough to assent to this Truth, meerly upon Grounds of Reason, but you should assent to it upon Grounds of Faith, as I said formerly, there are more clear Marks and Characters of a Deity stamped upon the holy Scriptures, than upon all the Works of Nature.* Now if there be clea-

rer

r Marks of a DEITY, ſtamped upon the Scrip-
ures, than upon the Works of Nature, it's plain
is evident Propoſitions cannot be the ultimate
roof of a DEITY; for certainly the cleareſt
haracters of ſuch a Truth muſt be the ulti-
ate Proof thereof.

He confeſſes in the 4 *Pag.* of that 2 *Epiſtle*, *that this Doctrine of his doth contradict in Terms, ſome unwary Expreſſions of* Marckius *and others*: Where we may obſerve, 1*ſt.* His Confeſſion, That he uſes not the Terms, and Way of ſpeaking that *Marckius* and other Reformed Divines do on this Head, (as is alſo true in many other particulars) and conſequently that he uſes not a Form of ſound Words: Readily there is ſome thing under it when Men reject the ordinary Terms, however they may pretend to mean the ſame Thing. 2*dly.* We may obſerve, his ſevere Cenſures upon *Marckius* and other Proteſtant Divines, as uſing unwary Expreſſions here; for what Orthodox Divines can he produce, ſpeaking in his Dialect upon this Head? It ſeems no Divine but himſelf hath taken up this Controverſy with *Socinians* aright, or expreſſed it in fit Terms. 3*dly.* We obſerve his rude Way of treating them; not only does he charge them as uſing unwary Expreſſions, but makes them contradict themſelves, as ſpeaking in one Place what contradicts themſelves in another; and no wonder for he treats the *Confeſſion of Faith* in the ſame civil Manner. 4*thly.* I would know what theſe unwary Expreſſions of *Marckius* and others are, if they be any other than what Divines do make uſe of upon

this Subject, had he ſpecified them we ſhoul
have underſtood his Mind better.

FURTHER, in that ſecond Letter to Mr. *Ro
wan*, *Pag.* 5. he ſays, *That* Turrettin *on this Que
ſtion quibb'es, and that neither he nor other Syſtemati
Divines have handled this Queſtion diſtinctly; ſo as t
make Students underſtand it.* But 1*ſt.* It ſeems ne
ver any ſet this Queſtion in it's true Light, no
underſtood it, *till he aroſe, a Teacher in* Iſrael. 2*dly*
It is true, That Religion never contradicts ſound
Reaſon, tho' it be above its Comprehenſion; ye
it ſavours very ill, that he juſtifies theſe two Pro
poſitions of *Smalcius* and *Oſtorodius* (as true) cited
by *Turrettin*, 1*ſt.* *Homo non tenetur credere, quod
Ratio dictat falſum eſſe.* 2dly. *Si Rationi adverſa
tur Religio, eo ipſo Religio non eſſet; ſumma enim e
ipſa Ratio Religio eſt.* Since he cannot but know,
That, 1*ſt.* *Socinians* make any Article of Religion,
to contradict Reaſon, if it be above Reaſon's
Comprehenſion. 2*dly.* Since he cannot but know,
That *Oſtorodius* and *Smalcius* maintain theſe Pro
poſitions, not by Way of ſimple Connection be
twixt Reaſon and Religion; but by Way of Sub
ordination: So that they make Reaſon the Judge
and Rule, according to which, Points of Religi
on are to be determined. 3*dly.* I wiſh he had
ſet down diſtinctly what *Socinians* maintain on
this Head; ſince it ſeems no Divine before him
ſelf, hath ever taken up their Mind diſtinctly,
as alſo what he himſelf maintains in Oppoſition to
the *Socinians*, and then we ſhould have underſtood
how far he differs from them; but this he was not
pleaſed to do, for Reaſons known to himſelf.
4*ly.* I hope *Hoornbeck* againſt the *Socinians* has
handled

andled this Queſtion diſtinctly: Where, 1*ſt*. He tes a great many Paſſages out of *Socinian* and *rminian* Authors, ſhewing what they maintain. *dly*. He explains this Queſtion by ſeveral Diſtinions: As 1*ſt*. *That* Reaſon *ſignifies both the Faulty, as alſo the Act, or Propoſition*, which laſt takes Mr. *Simſon*'s Senſe of Reaſon. 2*dly*. He diſtinguiſhes betwixt *Reaſon* as the *Subject*, *Inſtrument* d *Rule*; and tells us, *That the Queſtion is concerng Reaſon as a Rule*; which laſt Place Profeſſor *mſon* aſcribes to Reaſon, with the *Socinians*. 3*ly*. e diſtinguiſhes the *Actings of Reaſon* into theſe *ſimple Apprehenſion*, and *Argumentation*; by inferng one thing from another: And ſays, *The Queon is not concerning either of theſe Acts of Reaſon*: e grants as to the firſt, *That the Rational Faculty the Subject, that takes up the Points of Religion*. As the ſecond, *That Reaſon is the Inſtrument*: ut he tells us, *That the Queſtion is concerng Reaſon as a Rule, determining concerning Points Faith, according to its Dictates* (*i. e.* Mr. *Simſon*'s ident Propoſitions) and this *Place* he denies *to eaſon*. 4*thly*. He diſtinguiſhes betwixt *Judicium ationis quo quid apprehendo*; *et Judicium Præſcripnis, vel Judicium ob quod, vel propter quod*; and he owes the *firſt*, but not the *ſecond* to Reaſon. *bly*. He diſtinguiſheth betwixt *Principium quod*, *o, et ex quo, vel cur*.; and gives only the laſt to *Scriptures*. 6*thly*. He makes *the Spirit ſpeaking the Scriptures the Judge of Controverſies, and the riptures themſelves the only Rule*. A great many her excellent Diſtinctions to this Purpoſe he hath, t we refer the Reader to the Book it ſelf: where will find how far Mr. *Simſon* differs from

this Author; and one would think, That *Hoornbeck* underſtood this Controverſie with *Socinians* very well.

IN a Word the indifferent Reader may judge of the Moment and Importance of this Point, and whether or not Mr. *Simſon* has ſwerved from our common Doctrine on this Head, contained in the Scriptures and the *Confeſſion of Faith*. But I add no more upon this Subject.

CHAP. XIII.

An unica Anima humana poteſt informare diverſa, et diſſita Corpora humana et omnes vitales et rationales Actiones in iis præſtare?

Or, *If one Soul can be united to three Diſtinct Bodies?*

TO this Mr. *Simſon* anſwers, That this Article as expreſſed in the Libel in Latine, is not his. 2*dly*. He ſays, *Pag*. 258. *That it is falſe That all or ſeveral vital Actions are performed by the Body alone, without the Concurrence of the Soul.* Whether it be true or falſe I ſhall not debate, it being a meer Philoſophical Point; In general I conceive it certain, That all vital Actions depend upon the Union of the Body with the Soul? but how the Soul influences every vital Motion, or if it influence every vital Motion, I judge will be a Task to explain. But I do not think it much to the Purpoſe in hand, to Examine his Arguments on this head, or whether it be true or falſe, and ſo paſs it.

PAG. 259. He ſays, *Our Divines do commonly grant to* Socinians, *that among Creatures the Eſſence*

or Intelligent Subſtances muſt neceſſarly be multiplied according to the Number of the Perſons, and tells us, *that the* Socinians *boaſt much of this Conceſſion, and uſe their outmoſt Effort to employ it againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity.* 2*dly*. He ſays, *tho' it be a good and ſolid Anſwer to this* Socinian *Argument*, (viz. *It is impoſſible there can be a Plurality of Perſons among the Creatures, unleſs there be an equal Plurality of Eſſences or Intelligent Subſtances, therefore there cannot be a Plurality of Divine Perſons, unleſs there be an equal Plurality of Divine Eſſences or Subſtances*) *to deny this Conſequence; yet he would not grant them the Antecedent, which they make ſo ill uſe of, unleſs it were unqueſtionably true, that it is impoſſible for GOD, to create three Perſons, that have one common rational Nature or intelligent Subſtance.*

NOW *this he does not think impoſſible, becauſe God can of his Infinite Wiſdom and Power create a Spirit Suitably qualified and unite it to three diſtinct humane Bodies, ſo as it may perform in each of them all theſe vital and rational Actions that three diſtinct Souls of Men do ordinarly in their diſtinct Bodies.* And this he ſays, *it may do with ſuch variety in their Actions as is Conſiſtent with their proceeding from one rational Soul; And that in ſuch a Caſe, theſe three Bodies thus animated and acted, tho' by one Soul producing in them ſuch vital and rational Actions, would be juſtly eſteemed three Perſons.* And further tells us, *That all the uſe he makes of this Suppoſition, is to ſhew the above-mentioned Antecedent to be falſe, which is commonly yeilded to the* Socinians, *and ſo to take from them that Handle of cavelling againſt the Doctrine of the Trinity.*

BUT, 1*ſt*. If the above-named Antecedent be falſe, as he ſays; how grants he that the Anſwer

of

of the Orthodox Divines is good and ſolid? Can the Anſwer be good and ſolid, that yeilds a falſe Propoſition to be true? *2dly.* If the Anſwer be good and ſolid, why finds he fault with the Orthodox Divines for yeilding a Propoſition as true, which is falſe? *3dly.* It ſeems there was never a right Anſwer given by Divines to this Argument of *Socinians*, till his εὕρημα appeared. *4thly.* I perceive he goes about to defend this great Myſtery againſt *Socinians*, by Reaſon or Natural Light, and from *Similes* of the like Nature, to ſhew its Conſiſtency with Natural Reaſon; which tho' agreeable enough to his Doctrine of Reaſon's being the ultimate Principle and Proof of Religion, whereby he reſolves our Faith of all the Articles of Religion, and ſo of this Myſtery into Reaſon, or his evident Propoſitions, of which I think this his *Simile* is none; yet is found to be none of the moſt ſucceſsful ways of defending the Truth againſt its Adverſaries. For, *5thly.* It has been obſerved by very ſolid Divines, that the *Similes* ſome have uſed to illuſtrate this great Myſtery, have been but of little uſe (becauſe there neither is nor can be any thing like it in Nature) and that it had been better to have forborn them; And I judge this *Simile* of his ſhall not do much better Service. *6thly.* It is hard for us to judge of what GOD can do; yet if it be not impoſſible for GOD to create a Soul united to three Bodies, I ſee no more Impoſſibility in the thing, *viz.* Of one Soul being united to four, yea, ſix or more Bodies: For if we once give Way to this Suppoſition, it will plainly follow, That GOD can unite a Soul to ſix or more Bodies, ſince here we cannot

not limite GOD's Power; And ſince upon this Suppoſition he might as eaſily create a Soul ſo qualified. And if ſo, his *Simile* will not do him much Service, unleſs it be to tempt one to think there may be more Perſons in the God-head than three. 7*thly*. Even in that caſe there are ſtill three diſtinct Subſtances in part, *viz*. three Bodies; And therefore the Antecedent is ſtill true in a good Meaſure, that there cannot be a Multiplication of Perſons among Creatures, without a Multiplication of Subſtances, either in whole or in part. 8*thly*. The Plurality of Bodies does not ſeem to lay a Foundation for the Plurality of Perſons; for in that caſe it would ſeem more proper to ſay, there is but one Perſon made up of one Soul, and and three Bodies, for the Perſonality among Creatures is chiefly founded in the Soul as a rational intelligent Being; Nor do I ſee, how the Multiplication of Bodies makes the Multiplication of Perſons; But the Similitude tho' Ingenious, yet I conceive is too groſs.

HE further ſays, *Pag.* 260. *That in caſe GOD ſhould create ſuch a Soul and unite it to three Bodies, he would alſo doubtleſs in his Infinite Wiſdom ſo order the Circumſtances of that Soul and its three Bodies, as to admit none of Mr.* Webſter's *abſurd Suppoſitions*, and he hopes, *that both theſe are within the Compaſs of his Infinite Power and Wiſdom.*

IT ſeems then, That upon this Suppoſition, it were impoſſible, that theſe three Bodies could be far ſeparate, or that one Body could ſuffer while the other is well; or that one Body could die, while the other two lives; or that the Soul could ſin in one Body, while it is exerciſing Holineſs in

in the other; or else Mr. *Webster*'s Absurdities must follow, as, That the same Soul is both in the East and West *Indies* at once; or that the same Soul is holy in one Body, and sinful in another; and in Heaven, Hell, and on Earth, at the same Time; having done well in one Body, ill in the second, and the third Body being still alive. 2*dly*. Upon his Supposition, these three Bodies must be either locally distant one from another as our Bodies are; and then they must either ay move the same Way, otherwise the Soul is at the same Time moving East, West, and North, *&c.* according to the different Motions of these Bodies locally distant one from another: Besides, it is hard to conceive how the same Soul can have three different Apprehensions, Reasonings, Judgments, *&c.* according to the different Objects that present themselves to the three several Bodies. *Or else he must say*, That the three Bodies are physically united one to another, as *Buchanan* tells us in his History of a Monster that had a double Body from the Loins, but had two Souls. But this is to illustrate that tremenduous Mystery by some thing monstruous; for three Bodies thus united to one Soul, would be a Monster indeed, and as strange as one Body united to more Souls! I conceive the inventing of this *Simile* to be the Effect of a luxuriant Invention, and of proud Reason, endeavouring to measure the most profound Mysteries of Religion by its dark, narrow and blind Comprehension, which is indeed natural to all Men.

PAGE 261. He grants, *That a Spirit cannot be present at once, in two or three Places, that may be named, and thinks, that a Spirit is present only in one* Place

Place at a Time: But then ſays, *It is to be enquired how great or ſmall that Place is.* Further he thinks, *That they not only are preſent in a Place, but alſo are preſent in a diviſible Part of Space,* which he ſays, *Is as agreeable to their Nature, as being preſent in a Point:* And thinks, *That their Preſence in a diviſible Part of Space, is plain from their moving diſtant Parts of Matter at that ſame Inſtant, and giving them oppoſite Directions.* And he illuſtrates it from this, *That GOD can create a Spirit that can be preſent in the Place of the Largneſs of the eight Part of an Inch Square, and can move four Bodies, plac'd at the four Sides of that Square in a Line perpendicular to each of its four Sides at the ſame inſtant of Time:* In this Caſe he ſays, *It is evident, That the Spirit is preſent in a diviſible Part of Space, and doth immediately exerciſe its Power of moving Matter upon different Bodies diſtant one from another about the eighth Part of an Inch, and confirms this by our Soul's giving Motion to ſeveral Organs of the Body at the ſame Time.* Further he ſays, *That if GOD can make a Spirit that can move Bodie scontrariwiſe at the eighth Part of an Inch's Diſtance, it is not to be doubted, but that by his infinite Power he can make a Spirit that can move them at an Inch, or a Mile's Diſtance; and that therefore the Place of its Preſence muſt extend as far as the immediate Exerciſe of his Power doth reach at the ſame Inſtant.* And ſays, *That a Place of that Extent, would be the Place of that Spirit, in which it would exerciſe all its other Faculties, as well as move Bodies, and ſo could perform vital and rational Actions in three different Bodies, that keep within the Diſtance of a Mile Square to one another, which they*

would

would certainly do, unleſs removed further one from another by Force: In which Caſe, one or two of them would die.

BUT 1*ſt*. Beſides that we conceive *Similes*, to illuſtrate this grand Myſtery in Religion, to do no great Service that Way: We judge, That ſuch *Similes*, as need themſelves *Mathematical Demonſtrations* to confirm their Poſſibility, to be of far leſs Uſe for this End: This ſeems to lead to a graffing of the great Myſteries of Religion upon *Mathematicks* and Natural Reaſon, whereby proud Men would be for accounting for the greateſt Myſteries of Religion, from *Mathematical Demonſtrations*, or evident Propoſitions, as they account for other natural *Phenomena's*, which leads to a corrupting of Theology with vain Philoſophy, againſt which *Paul* cautions us, *Col*: 2. And was the great Fault of the *Popiſh* School-men. 2*dly*. Tho' it be certain, That a created Spirit is in a Place, as they ſpeak, *circumſcriptively*, yet we judge, we cannot conceive it to be either in a *Point*, or a diviſible Place, but only in a Place *in general* in a Way of ſimple Exiſtence, abſtracting from the Manner of its being in a Place: For both Ways lead us to conceive of a Spirit, as extended like a Body. 3*dly*. I would know how a Spirit is preſent in a diviſible Place? It muſt either be by Way of *Co-extenſion* with that diviſible Place, ſo as the Spirit fills up that diviſible Place, (and this he ſeems plainly to ſay, while he affirms, That the Place of ſuch a Spirit extends as far as the immediate Exerciſe of its Power, and that a Place of that Extent would be the Place of that Spirit) but this plainly leads to aſcribe Extenſion to a Spirit, which is common-

commonly made a Property of Matter; or if it be only preſent in a diviſible Place *abſtractly*, by Way of ſimple Exiſtence; why ſays he, *That the Place of a Mile's Extent would be the Place of that Spirit, unleſs it fill up all the Parts of that diviſible Space?* 4*thly*. When a Spirit is in ſuch a Place of the Extent of an Inch, or of a Mile, and moves the Bodies at the oppoſite Sides of that Place to different Airths. 1*ſt*. I would know, if it be preſent in all the Parts of that Place of a Mile's Extent: If ſo, how can this be without conceiving the Spirit to be coextended to that Place, which plainly is to aſcribe Extenſion to a Spirit. 2*dly*. When the Bodies are removed one from another, it would ſeem, That that diviſible Place, in which the Spirit is, muſt alſo be extended; ſo that the Spirit occupies a larger Place, as the Bodies are removed one from another; for he himſelf ſays, *That the Place whether of an Inch or a Miles Extent, is the place of the Spirits Preſence.* 5*ly*. Then conſequently a Spirit can occupy ſometimes a leſſer, ſometimes a greater diviſible Space, which Things how they agree to the ſimple Nature of a Spirit, I cannot ſo well diſcern. 6*thly*. I ſuppoſe it's plain, That a Spirit may impreſs ſuch a ſtrong Motion upon a Body as it may carry it to a Place where the Spirit it ſelf is not exiſting; and therefore the Preſence of a Spirit, extends not as far as the Exerciſe of its Matter-moving Power; otherwiſe when a Spirit moves two Bodies at the ſame Time, the one Eaſt, and the other Weſt, ſuch a Spirit at the ſame Time, would move both Eaſt and Weſt. 7*thly*. He grants, That if the Bodies were removed further than

the

the limited Space, that one or two of these Bodies would die in that Case; I would know, what becomes of the Soul that's united to the Bodies that die, either it goes to Heaven or Hell, or hath no Existence, but in the Body that survives? Further, since in this Case, according to his Supposition, there would be three different Persons, I would know whether the Soul might not act differently in the three Bodies, which by their Union with the Spirit make up three Persons? To say that it could not, were easy to disprove, were it not, that we are wearied of this Subject. If it can, then the same Spirit in a future Life, might be in different States, according to the Diversity of its Actings in the several Bodies. 8*thly*. If a Spirit may be united to three Bodies at a Mile's Distance, I see not but it is as possible by the Power of GOD, that it be united to three, or more Bodies, at a Thousand, or two Thousand Miles Distance; and so the same Spirit at the same Time, be both in the East and West *Indies*; and by Consequence, must needs fill up all the interjacent Space betwixt these two Places; for how it can be present in two Bodies at a Mile or a Thousand Miles Distance, and not fill up the Space betwixt them, is hard to conceive. *Lastly*, To conclude I do not see what Service a Similitude that seems to include something monstruous in its Nature, and is plainly cumbered with such Difficulties, can either do, to illustrate that glorious, and tremenduous Mystery, to which there can be nothing like here; or to take off the *Socinian* Objection; whether the reformed Churches be obliged to him for this

Invention

Invention of his; and whether this Invention is not the Fruit of a Deſign to account for all the Myſteries of our Religion, from the Principles of natural Reaſon, or his evident Propoſitions, I leave it to the Judgment of any diſcerning Perſon to determine.

CHAP. XIV.

Concerning a Double Juſtification, &c.

PRofeſſor *Simſon Pag.* 264. of his Anſwers, ſays, *He thinks there is a twofold Juſtification; both of them taken in a Forenſick Senſe,* and tells us, *That ſome Divines call the one the Juſtification of a Sinner, and the other the Juſtification of a Righteous Perſon. The former,* he ſays, *is the very ſame Juſtification which* Paul *teaches,* Rom: 3. *or Juſtification by Faith deſcribed in our* Confeſſion *and* Catechiſms, *in which GOD abſolves the ſinner upon the account of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs imputed to him, and received by Faith,* &c. *The other is the ſame with Juſtification by Works taught by* James, Chap: 2d. *of his* Epiſtle; *when the Believer is ſuppoſed to be accuſed of groſs Hypocriſie, want of true Faith and Holineſs. In which caſe good Works are produced in Teſtimony of the Truth and Sincerity of his Faith, Love,* &c. *they being the Native Fruit and End of that Faith, which worketh by Love; and ſo the Perfection of it as* James *calls it,* Chap: 2. 22. *Which being unqueſtionable Documents of the Perſon's Righteouſneſs, he is juſtified or abſolved (from this Charge) and decerned to be treated as a Righteous Perſon, by the Sentence of the Judge, whether GOD*

or Man, according as he is ſuppoſed to be thus accuſed either before the one or the other.

HE further tells us, *That his Opinion on this Head is fully explained in* Pictet's Theolog: Chriſt. Lib: 10. Cap. 3. to 7. In which laſt Chapter he ſays, *he explains clearly and convincingly the Juſtification of a Righteous Perſon ſpoken of by* James, *and that he clears and confirms the ordinary Way of reconciling theſe two Apoſtles better than any other he has read; And that the ſpecial Advantage of his Method is, That he conſiders theſe two different Juſtifications, as proceeding on different Libels, and does not place the Difference of them in this; That the one is a Juſtification of the Perſon, and the other of his Faith; which laſt Way of ſpeaking is not,* ſays he, *to be found in Scripture, tho' the Thing meant by it be therein taught*: And ſays, *That* Pictet's *Way of explaining it by a twofold Juſtification of our Perſons on two different Libels, gives a clearer* Idea *of the Purpoſe; for* James *ſpeaks of the Juſtification of Perſons,* Chap. 2. 21. Was not *Abraham* our Father juſtified by Works, ſo *Rahab, Verſe* 25. And ſays. Page 267. *That it's evident from the Apoſtle's Diſcourſe, that the Accuſation he ſpeaks of with reſpect to* Abraham, Rahab, *or any other, from which they are juſtified by Works, is, That they are not true Believers, and have no Intereſt in Chriſt; but are Hypocrites, having only a Counterfeit dead Faith: And that therefore Works being the Fruit of juſtifying Faith, are the only proper Evidences for Exculpation in this Caſe, and when found in the Perſon thus accuſed, they do prove that he is a true Believer, who has that Faith which worketh by Love,* &c. *And therefore he is abſolved from this Charge of Hypocriſie, want of true Faith,* &c.

&c. and so being found a sincere and true Believer, the Righteous Judge determines he shall enjoy the Believer's and Righteous Man's Priviledges, &c.

FURTHER *Page* 267, and 268. He says, *That in the last Judgment, when every one is judged according to his Works by Jesus Christ, according to the Gospel, that the Libel will be of the same Nature with that just now mentioned: and that the Grand Question to be cleared in Judgment with respect to all Adult Persons, at least such as have heard the Gospel, will be whether they have truly believed in Christ, and by Faith got an Interest in his Satisfaction and Righteousness, and whether they be Holy. In which Case the proper Evidences to be adduced are their Works, which as mentioned before, do prove that they have an Interest in Christ, and in Pardon and Glory through him. And therefore says these Evidences being found in Believers, they are absolved from all that this Charge contains; and consequently from all that the Law of Works can charge them with, and are adjudged to the Possession of Eternal Glory, which they got a Right unto by Faith in Christ's Righteousness, and have also thereby been made meet for possessing it, the Truth of which has been publickly and solemnly proved in Judgment by their Works;* And says, *That in this Sense only they are justified by their Works, and in this Sense all the Passages of Scripture are to be understood, which say, that Men are to be judged according to their Works, or justified by their Works, as* Matth: 12. 37.

NOW upon this Head we offer these Considerations, *First*, I conceive a twofold Justification before GOD the great Judge, with Reference to Men's eternal State, Absolution from Wrath, and

and Right to Eternal Life is new and ſtrange Doctrine; for the Queſtion plainly muſt be underſtood thus, as is obvious: Now if there be a twofold Juſtification, the *Firſt* ſeems not to be perfect; and there muſt be a twofold Foundation of theſe twofold Sentences, *viz.* Chriſt's Righteouſneſs of the firſt, and Men's good Works of the laſt. 2*dly.* Our *Confeſſion of Faith* ſpeaks but of one Juſtification before GOD, *viz.* by Faith in Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; but he finds a ſecond Juſtification by Works, *viz.* at the Great Day. It is ſtrange there ſhould be ſuch a material Omiſſion in the *Confeſſion* as of this ſecond Juſtification. 3*dly.* He confounds the Sentence of Juſtification, with the Publication and Proclamation of it at the Great Day; for by the ſame Reaſon he may make a twofold Adoption too; for the Time of compleat Redemption, or Chriſt's ſecond coming is called the Day of Adoption, *Rom.* 8. 23. 4*thly.* He confounds the Ground of the Sentence of Juſtification, with the Evidences of a juſtified State; we are not therefore juſtified by good Works, becauſe they are produced before the World at that Day, as Evidences of a juſtified State. 5*ly.* I would know in this Caſe, what is the Charge, it muſt either be their liableneſs to Wrath by Reaſon of their Sins; but this Charge they are freed from in their being juſtified upon believing; or it muſt be a Charge of Hypocriſie under the Maſk of a Profeſſion: But beſides, that it reſolves into the firſt Charge, and ſo muſt have the ſame Foundation for Abſolution, *viz.* an Imputed Righteouſneſs; good Works are not that which Conſtitute a Man ſincere, or not an Hypo-

Hypocrite, but an Union with Chriſt by juſtifying Faith, they are only the Evidences of the Truth of what makes a Man not an Hypocrite, *viz.* the foreſaid Union with Chriſt by Faith; and therefore in that Senſe good Works are not the Foundation upon which that Sentence goes. Further, this Kind of Juſtification is not a Juſtification of a Believer's State (for he is ſuppoſed to be juſtified already) but a Juſtification from a falſe Slander as to his good State; and in this Senſe you may make as many Juſtifications as are the falſe Accuſations a Believer meets with as to his State; but I think this an improper Way of ſpeaking.

6. I would know, what it is a Man is abſolved from, and adjudged to in this ſecond Juſtification; for it muſt be either a Liableneſs to the Curſe he is abſolved from, and a Right to Eternal Life he is adjudged to, but this plainly belongs to the firſt Juſtification by Faith in Chriſt's Righteouſneſs; or it is his being adjudged to, and put in the actual Poſſeſſion of Eternal Life: But if ſo, then firſt he plainly confounds the Sentence of Juſtification with the Publication and ſolemn Execution of it, when they are put in the actual Poſſeſſion of that Glory, to which they had a Right long before upon Believing. 2*dly*. He ſeems to make Chriſt's Righteouſneſs the Foundation of our firſt Juſtification, *viz.* a Right to Life; and good Works the Foundation of the ſecond, *viz.* the actual Poſſeſſion of Glory; for he makes good Works the Ground of the ſecond Sentence at the great Day. But I ever thought that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs was the Foundation of our being adjudged to the

Poſſeſſion of Glory, as well as of our right to it; and if his Righteouſueſs be the only Foundation of our being adjudged to the actual Poſſeſſion of Glory, as well as of our having a Right to it, then there is not a twofold Juſtification before GOD, *viz.* one here by Believing, and another at the great Day by good Works; becauſe different Juſtifications ſuppoſe different Grounds of Juſtification; or is it a Charge of Hypocriſie, that we are abſolved from at that Day? but this we have juſt now conſidered: Beſides that it is not the only far leſs the great Thing to be conſidered in the Juſtification at the great Day, it is their being ſolemnly adjudged and taken to the actual Poſſeſſion of eternal Glory, and it is but Reaſon, that the Juſtification have the Denomination, from what is the principal Thing in it. *7thly.* Juſtification ſpeaking properly relates to a Man's State, and ſuppoſes a Charge from the Law and Juſtice of GOD, as is plain; but from this a Man is abſolved upon his believing, ſo as there is no Condemnation to ſuch, *Rom;* 8. 1. therefore there is no need of a ſecond Juſtification, wherein a Man has to do with a broken Law, which brings in another Conſideration: For (in the 8*th.* place) *Pag:* 286. he ſays, That in this ſecond Juſtification they are abſolved from all that this Charge contains, and conſequently from all that the Law of Works can charge them with. But, 1*ſt.* He fairly ſuppoſeth, That the Law of Works hath ſome thing wherewith it chargeth a Believer: Now this is ſtrange; for is not a Man upon his firſt believing abſolved from all wherewith the Law of Works can charge him? So that there is no Condemnation to ſuch, *Rom.* 8. 1, 2, 3.

Does

Does the Law charge any, but who are under it, *Rom.* 3. 19. And *Paul* tells us, *That Believers are not under the Law, Rom.* 6. 14. Therefore the Law of Works hath nothing wherewith to charge a Believer, becauſe by his believing he is brought from under the Law or Covenant of Works, being a Child, not of the bond, but of the free Woman, *Gal.* 4. 31. *2dly.* Then Believers are juſtified from the charge of the Law or Covenant of Works, not only by Chriſt's imputed Righteouſneſs, but by their own Works, ſo that a Believer is juſtified from the Law of Works, by his own Works, this ſeems ſtrange indeed! *3dly.* The Law of Works charges them as liable to Wrath becauſe Tranſgreſſors, and wanting a perfect Righteouſneſs it requires; ſo that, according to Mr. *Simſon* in this ſecond Juſtification, they are abſolved from Wrath, and are declared to have a Right to Life, which is the very ſame with the firſt Juſtification, and, according to him, the Ground of this Sentence is their good Works: For upon this he ſeems to found this Sentence, which is a little ſtrange! Or if good Works be only Evidences of the Equity of the Sentence, and not the Foundation upon which their Abſolution from every thing the Law can charge them with, is bottom'd, then this is not a ſecond Juſtification, becauſe different Juſtifications ſuppoſe different Grounds.

2. As to the Juſtification of a righteous Perſon before GOD by his good Works, it ſounds very harſh; for the Scripture tells us of GOD's juſtifying the ungodly that believeth, *Rom:* 4. 5. but ſpeaks not of the Juſtifying of him, as being

righteous; for if he be juſtified already, he needs not a ſecond Juſtification. Beſides, this plainly lays a Foundation for carnal glorying, even tho' they be juſtified once already: We ſee the moſt holy Saints who knew they were juſtified already, yet could not think of ſtanding before GOD upon this Ground, not only in this Life, *Pſal.* 130. but alſo at the Day of Judgment, *Phil.* 3. *That I may be found in him, &c.* It is ſtrange if this ſecond Juſtification at the great Day, were upon the Bottom of good Works, that *Paul* ſo much dreaded that which was the Foundation of that Sentence, ſince ſcarce ever any meer Man had more to lean to this Way! In a Word this Juſtification, of a Sinner and of a righteous Man, ſeems to look a little ſquint to the *Papiſts Duplex Juſtificatio*, which they call firſt and ſecond: For the firſt, according to *Papiſts*, is the Juſtification of a Sinner; and the ſecond the Juſtification of a righteous Man, though I grant he and they explain them in a different Way.

3. As for *Jam.* 2. where it is ſaid, *That a Man is juſtified by Works, and not by Faith only*, it is plain, That it is to be underſtood of the Evidence and Proof of our juſtified State, or State of Grace before Men; ſo that the plain Meaning is, That it is not a bare Profeſſion of Faith without Works, that will prove before Men that we are juſtified before GOD from the Guilt of Sin, but good Works flowing from Faith, as is plain from the 18 *Verſe* of that *Chap.* where it is ſaid, *ſhew me thy Faith without thy Works* (which is impoſſible) *and I will ſhew thee my Faith by my Works* (which indeed is the habile and only way) from which its plain he ſpeaks

ſpeaks of the Evidence of a true Faith; ſo that the Apoſtle treats not of a ſecond Juſtification, but of the Evidence and Proof of a true Faith, as is further plain from *Ver.* 14 of that 2 *Chap. What doth it profit my Brethren, tho' a Man ſay he hath Faith and have not Works, &c.* where it is plain, by comparing it with the 15 *Verſ.* that he is ſpeaking of the Fruits of a true Faith before the World, and not of a ſecond Juſtification properly ſo called.

WHICH is plain from this, That the Juſtification he ſpeaks of, is a Juſtification that is by Faith alſo (for he ſays a Man is juſtified by Works, not by Faith only) ſo that Faith here hath a conjunct Share with good Works in this Juſtification; but this cannot be, becauſe a bare Act of Faith cannot evidence its Sincerity before the World, being latent in the Heart: And it is plain, it is of a Juſtification before Men *James* here ſpeaks of. And therefore the plain Meaning is (when it is ſaid a Man is juſtified by Works and not by Faith only) that it is not a bare Pretence to, or Profeſſion of Faith that proves a Man to have true Faith before the World, but good Works; as is plain from *Verſ:* 15, 16. of that *Chap. And one of you ſay unto them, Depart in Peace, &c.* 2*dly.* If it be a ſecond Juſtification, it muſt either be a Juſtification before Men or before GOD: If the firſt, the Queſtion is not concerning that, but of a ſecond Juſtification before GOD. Beſides, ſuch a Juſtification is but the Evidence of the firſt Juſtification: If the ſecond, then it is either a Juſtification that is an Abſolving from the Guilt of Sin, and adjudging to Eternal Life; but this is his firſt Juſtificati-

on

on, and granted by himſelf to be by Faith in a Mediator's Righteouſneſs (and by the way when ſpeaking of that Juſtification, *Pag.* 264 He ſays, indeed, *it is by Faith that we receive Chriſt's Righteouſneſs*, but he does not ſay it is only by Faith, as our *Catechiſms* expreſs it, which is agreeable enough to his Doctrine of making Repentance and good Works Prerequiſites of Juſtification as well as Faith) or it is a Juſtification from Hypocriſie, and as to the Sincerity of Faith and Love; but this cannot be, becauſe GOD being Omniſcient, knows the Truth of our Faith, abſtract from good Works, and needs not our good Works to notify to him the Sincerity of our Faith, and therefore the Juſtification here ſpoken of, muſt be underſtood of the Evidence of our juſtified State before Men, by our good Works. 3*dly*. It is plain, That the Apoſtle *James* here ſpeaks of Juſtification in this Life, ſo that, according to Mr. *Simſon*, there muſt be a threefold Juſtification before GOD, *viz.* two in this Life, one of a Sinner by Faith, a ſecond of a righteous Man by good Works, and a Third Juſtification by good Works at the Day of Judgment, which is new Doctrine indeed. 4*thly*. He calls good Works the Perfection of Faith, it is true that *James* ſays, *that* Abraham's *Faith was perfected by Works*, that is the Reality and Strength of it was evidenced; but if Mr *Simſon* call good Works the Perfection of *Faith*, becauſe they are the End of Faith; then it's laying hold on an imputed Righteouſneſs, is much more its Perfection, becauſe the firſt and principal End of Faith in order to our Juſtification before GOD, unleſs he mean, that good Works ſome way enter the

Nature of Faith, concerning which he did not explain himſelf ſo clearly, when ſpeaking of juſtifying Faith, as were to be wiſhed.

4. As for *Pictet* I have him not at preſent, only I remark, *1ſt.* That if *Pictet* explain *James* in the ordinary Way, it will not make much for his double Juſtification. *2dly.* If the Juſtification of the Truth of a Man's Faith be taught in that Place, as Mr. *Simſon* owns, there is no Ground to quarrel it, tho' it were not ſo expreſs in the Scriptures. *3dly.* Tho' there be a twofold Juſtification of our Perſons on two different Libels, it follows not that there are two different Juſtifications before GOD, far leſs two different Juſtifications as to our State; becauſe, as is plain, *James* there ſpeaks of a Juſtification before Men, *viz.* of the Truth of our Faith by good Works as the Evidence thereof: Nor did I ever read, or hear of an Orthodox Divine that exponed this Place, of a Juſtification before GOD by good Works.

5. As to the Juſtification at the laſt Day, I offer theſe Conſiderations, *1ſt.* I ever thought That that had been only, and chiefly a more ſolemn Pronouncing, and Publication of the Sentence of their Juſtification paſt upon their firſt believing; and not a ſecond, and diſtinct Kind of Juſtification, more than when the Spirit here in this Life intimates to Believers their Juſtification and Pardon; ſo that he confounds Juſtification with a ſolemn Publication of it, as alſo with the ſolemn Execution of that Sentence. *2dly.* It is true the Queſtion then will be cleared, whether they truly believed, but yet the great Sentence to be pronunced is not an abſolving them from the

the Charge of Hypocriſie, but a ſolemn Acquitting them from the Curſe of the Law, and Adjudging them to the actual Poſſeſſion of eternal Life, as having had a Right to it by believing; which is nothing elſe but a ſolemn Publication, and Execution of the Sentence of Juſtification, paſt long before upon their firſt believing; as is plain from 2 *Theſſ:* 1. 10. where it is ſaid, *he'll be glorified in his Saints in that Day*; becauſe the Apoſtle's Teſtimony was believed by the *Theſſalonians*. 3*dly*. He confounds the Ground or Foundation of the Sentence of Juſtification with the Evidences of the Reaſonableneſs of the Sentence; good Works are the Evidence of the Equity of the Sentence, 2 *Theſſ:* 1. 6, 7. but the Ground of the Sentence is Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, wherewith they ſtand clothed at that Day, as *Paul* tells us, *Phil:* 3. 9. *And be found in him, not having mine own Righteouſneſs*, &c. 4*thly*. If that Juſtification be a ſecond Juſtification, then I would know, whether Works be only Evidences of the Juſtification, or the Foundation of that Sentence at the great Day: If the firſt, this cannot make a diſtinct Juſtification, becauſe it is not the Evidence but a diſtinct Foundation that makes a different Juſtification. 2*dly*. If it be the Foundation and Bottom of the Sentence then pronounced; then 1*ſt*. We are juſtified by Faith here, and by good Works before GOD at the Day of Judgment: But I would think, that our Juſtification at the great Day of Judgment to be no leſs free, and of Grace, than our firſt Juſtification by Faith; for the Apoſtle tells, *that if it be of Works, it is no more of Grace*, *Rom:* 11. 2*dly*. I would know, what is the evil from which

which they are abſolved, and the good to which they are adjudged; it muſt either be the ſimple cancelling of the Obligation to Wrath, and a ſimple Right to Life; but this is the immediate Fruit of their firſt Juſtification, *to wit*, by Faith: Or it muſt be their actual Poſſeſſion of eternal Glory: If ſo, then Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is only the Foundation of a Title to Glory, but good Works is the Foundation of the actual Poſſeſſion of it, which is very groſs; for certainly Chriſt's imputed Righteouſneſs is equally the Foundation of our Title to Glory, and the actual Poſſeſſion of it, *Rom:* 5. 17. *Phil:* 3. 9. Or, 3*dly*. It muſt be the Truth of their Faith, and their Intereſt in Chriſt's Satisfaction, which is proven by their good Works, and ſo they are abſolved from the Charge of Hypocriſie; but this cannot found a ſecond Juſtification by Works, as is plain: Becauſe, *Firſt*, This is not the Principal Thing in Juſtification at that Day, which is a ſolemn Adjudging of a Believer to the Poſſeſſion of eternal Glory. 2*dly*. Becauſe this is but a Juſtification of their Faith, for in this Caſe the great Thing called in queſtion is the ſincerity of a Man's Faith, and ſo but indirectly affects his Perſon; but Juſtification properly ſpeaking, is a Juſtification of the Perſon, and as to his State. 3*dly*. This Way he may make as many Juſtifications at the Great Day of Judgment, as there are Grounds of Charges that may be alledged againſt them to prove their Hypocriſie. 4*thly*. This Way he will make a double Juſtification at the Day of Judgment; one whereby his Faith is approven as ſound; another whereby he is adjudged to the Poſſeſſion of eternal

nal Glory, which is new and ſtrange Doctrine. 5*thly*. The Juſtification of the ſincerity of a Believer's Faith relates to Accuſers that queſtion the Truth of it; but at the Day of Judgment there will be none that dare accuſe a Believer of Hypocriſie, and ſo no occaſion for ſuch a Sentence upon that Account; and therefore the juſtifying of the ſincerity of a Believer's Faith, muſt relate to the Accuſations and Calumnies they were liable to in this Life, and ſo the Juſtification at that Day muſt be only a Publication of the Sentence of Juſtification paſt upon them on their believing here, for which their good Works are then produced, not as the Foundation of any Sentence paſt upon them then, but as Evidences of the Equity of their being publickly aſſoilzied and juſtified at that Day.

6. HE confounds, *Being judged according to our Works, and being juſtified by them.* Now all Orthodox Divines uſe this Diſtinction in anſwer to *Papiſts*, when they urge Juſtification by Works: And ſay, *That good Works are the Rule and Meaſure according to which Men will be judged; but not the Foundation of the Sentence of Juſtification, nor the procuring Cauſe for which they are rewarded:* And ſo is the meaning of that Scripture, *Matth*: 12. 37. and the like: Where *Juſtifying* is ordinarly taken for rewarding, or executing the Sentence of Juſtification. 7*thly*. If Believers be juſtified by their Works at the great Day; Then, 1*ſt*. A Believer at that Day ſtands upon his own Bottom before GOD: But I would think, That a Believer can ſtand as little upon his own Bottom at that Day, as when he firſt believed: Sure *Paul* durſt

not

not venture to appear before GOD upon that Bottom, when he thought upon that Day, *Phil.* 3. 9. 2*dly*. Then their Justification at that Day is of Works, not of Grace; for it is the Justification of a righteous Person, and upon the Account of Works; but I had thought, That the Sinner's Justification at the great Day had been as free, and so as little by Works as his Justification upon his first believing. 3*dly*. I would know wherein that Sentence of Justification as different from the first Justification consists; he himself seems to make it a Justification of their Faith and Sincerity by their good Works; and so a Justification of themselves as sound Believers upon the Account of their good Works. But, 1*st*. He takes in more *Pag.* 268. where he tells us *That these Evidences of good Works being found in them, they are absolved from all that the Law of Works can charge them with, and adjudged to the Possession of eternal Glory* &c. So that, according to himself, the Foundation of their Absolution from all that the Law of Works charges them with, and so from the Curse of the Law, and also their being adjudged to Glory, will be their good Works at the Day of Judgment, which I would think harsh enough; for so their being actually saved from the Law's Curse, is founded upon their Works, and thereby their Right to Glory hath one Bottom, *viz.* Christ's Righteousness, and their actual Possession of it; another *viz.* their good Works. 2*dly*. Granting, That this is a Justification of their Faith, or of themselves as sound Believers; yet this is not the principal Thing in the Justification, at that Day; but their being

being adjudged to the Poſſeſſion of Glory, upon the Account of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs with which then they appear clothed; and it is but reaſonable to denominate the Juſtification from the principal Thing in it, and not from the leſs Principal. 3*dly*. I would know what is the Foundation upon which that Juſtification of them, as ſound Believers, and of their Faith as ſincere, is bottom'd; it cannot be their good Works; for, 1*ſt*. It is very abſurd to ſay, That when a Man hath to do in that great Day with GOD, acting as the Judge of the Quick and Dead, that he ſhould ſtand, or be juſtified before GOD, upon the Account of any thing in himſelf, as he muſt do, if in that Day he be juſtified by his Works. 2*dly*. Good Works cannot be the Foundation of that Sentence; becauſe the Foundation of juſtifying their Faith as ſound, muſt be the ſame with the Bottom, upon which the Soundneſs of their Faith in it ſelf is founded; but this cannot be good Works, becauſe they ſuppoſe a ſound Faith, from which they flow: It's their Faith's being bottomed upon a Mediator, clothed with a Righteouſneſs, and thereby their vital Union with him, as their Head, that is the Ground of the Soundneſs of their Faith: And ſo it is Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, into which this Juſtification reſolves, as its Bottom; and therefore cannot be a different and ſecond Juſtification; becauſe different Juſtifications muſt have different Foundations and Bottoms.

8. HE ſays, *Pag*. 267. *That by good Works a Believer is not only juſtified from the Charge of Hypocriſie, but being found a ſound Believer, the Righteous Judge determines, He ſhall enjoy the Believer's and*

and righteous Man's Privilege: Where, 1*ſt*. It is plain, he founds his poſſeſſing the Reward, and the Juſtification of his Faith as ſound, upon the ſame Bottom, *viz*. *Good Works*, which I would think groſs enough. 2*dly*. He plainly confounds the Grounds of our poſſeſſing the Glory, with the Meaſure, according to which we are rewarded; Chriſt's Righteouſneſs poſſeſſes the firſt Place, and good Works the ſecond. It is a common Saying among Divines, *That we are rewarded according, but not for our good Works.* Now it's the Bottom, upon which our getting the Reward is founded, not that according to which we are rewarded, that denominates and makes a diſtinct Juſtification.

PAGE 269. He finds fault with Mr. *Webſter*'s ſaying, *That the moſt perfect Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, is in all States and Conditions we can be in at any Time, fully ſufficient for our Juſtification; becauſe it anſwers the moſt rigorous Demands of the Law, and hath a ſuperabundant Plenitude of Merit in it.* Mr. *Simſon*'s Reaſon is, becauſe it cannot be ſufficient for a Perſon's Juſtification who hath died in final Impenitency; and ſo neither for an elect Perſon's Juſtification, while in a State of Unbelief, *&c.* Now he ſeems to ly at a Catch, and flee at a Shadow: For any Body of common Senſe may ſee, That the Sufficiency of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs for one's Juſtification, ſuppoſes the Perſon to be in that State, wherein the Application of it is poſſible; which is not the Caſe of one that dies in final Impenitency. 2*dly*. If Sufficiency be underſtood, as taking in the actual Application of that Righteouſneſs; then it plainly

plainly ſuppoſes actual Faith upon the Part of the Perſon to whom it is ſufficient; which is not the Caſe of an Elect, while in a State of Nature. But if it be underſtood of ſuch a Sufficiency to juſtify, as abſtracts from the actual Application of it; then it is ſufficient to juſtifie an elect Perſon, who is in a State of Nature, but ſtill upon Suppoſition of his believing; which he himſelf owns to be a neceſſary Mean for the Application of it. But I inſiſt no longer on this, as being rather a Cavil than an Argument of any Weight.

TO conclude, I leave it to the Judgment of every indifferent Reader, to obſerve the Tendency of this Doctrine of a twofold Juſtification, if it be not firſt a needleſs Multiplication of Juſtifications before GOD. 2*dly*. If it do not tend to lead Men off the only and proper *Baſis*, *viz.* Chriſt's Righteouſneſs in that Day, when they are to make their great and ſolemn Appearance before the great Judge of the Quick and Dead.

CHAP. XV.

Concerning Chriſt's Righteouſneſs.

THE Thing here charged by Mr. *Webſter* is, *That when Mr.* Simſon *was treating of Chriſt's imputed Righteouſneſs, he never called it a formal Imputation of the Righteouſneſs it ſelf, in the Senſe Orthodox Divines explain it.* 2dly. *That Mr.* Simſon *wiſheth, That our Divines, writing on that Head,*

did

did not favour the Antinomian *Error, and border upon it.*

The first Part of this Charge Mr. *Simson* denies, and says, *That he teaches the Doctrine of Christ's imputed Righteousness, as is taught by our* Confession *and* Catechisms, *and by* Marckius; *which, whether it be be so or not, may appear afterward.* 2dly. He says, *These Words (a formal Imputation, of Christ's Righteousness) are ambiguous and may be understood two Ways,* 1st. *In the Sense in which all Orthodox Divines explain the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.* 2dly. *The Meaning may be, That all Orthodox Divines do not only assert, That there is a formal Imputation of Christ's Righteousness it self, but have some peculiar Sense in which they understand this Proposition: Which of these is Mr.* Webster's *Meaning,* he says, *he knows not; and therefore tells us, he will answer them both.*

As to the first Branch, he says, *It is notoriously false, That all Orthodox Divines explain their Sense of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, by asserting that it is a formal Imputation of the Righteousness it self: For the Authors of our* Confession *and* Catechisms *insert no such Proposition in them; neither have* Marckius *or* Turrettin *any such Assertion. But grants, if by formal Imputation be meant, That it is the Righteousness of Christ himself, that is really and truly imputed, and is the Consideration upon, and for which we obtain Pardon of Sin, and Acceptance of our Persons with GOD,* Pag: 272. *That then this is that which he constantly teaches, though he doth not know, if he use the Term,* formal Imputation, and Righteousness it self, *which he tells us, is altogether needless, in the Way he explains Imputation; because*

in

in his Opinion, Imputation of Sin, or Righteousness by a divine Act, admits of no Distinction: And so if Christ's Righteousness it self be not imputed, he thinks it is not at all imputed; being of the same Mind with Respect to it, as he declared above, about the Imputation of Sin. And further he tells us, *That to say Christ's Righteousness, is imputed only, as to the Effects of it, is to deny the Imputation it self; and to say, we only receive Benefits by, or upon Occasion of it, as Doctor* Owen *well observes upon Justification,* Pag. 253. *with whom,* he says, *he fully agrees about the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.*

As to the second Branch or Sense of the Proposition, he tells us, *He can say nothing about it till Mr.* Webster *explain himself.* For he says, *He knows no Sense but one, in which our Divines explain the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, which is the same mentioned in our* Confession of Faith; *which* he says, *he defends.* And further says, *He knows not who they are, whom Mr.* Webster *calls Orthodox Divines, if it be not Doctor* Crisp *and his Fellows; seing he hath not named the* Antinomians *among the Sects that are erroneous upon this Head.*

3. PAGE 274. He affirms, *That it is false, that he does not own the formal Imputation of Christ's active Righteousness, if thereby be understood only a true and real Imputation of Christ's Obedience in Opposition to these who say, That Christ's Righteousness it self, is not imputed to us, but only the Effects of it.*

As to the second branch of the Charge, *Pag.* 276. *That he wished our Divines writing on this Subject did not favour the* Antinomian *Error, or were*

not

not bordering on Antinomianism. He answers, *That he grants that he sometimes notices, That some of our Divines, even of these who do not at all incline to* Antinomianism, *are not so cautious in their Expressions now and then, as were to be wished, as these who say the Covenant of Grace is not mutual, and who say, That the Gospel is only a Bundle of absolute Promises, and contains neither Precepts nor Threatnings, and that the pressing them to Study Holiness in the Strength of Christ, as a necessary Mean and Condition of Salvation, tho' not of Justification is legal Preaching, or Preaching up the Covenant of Works in stead of the Gospel, which Errors are well opposed by Mr.* Rutherford, *&c.*

UPON this Head I would offer the following Remarks and Considerations. And, 1*st*. I conceive that he keeps off here with long Weapons, and doth not explain himself so clearly upon this Head, as were to be wished. For, 2*dly*. What great Darkness can there be in that Expression, *A formal Imputation of Christ's Righteousness itself*, that makes it so very dubious, as he never uses it himself, according to his own Confession? It seems much like the *Arminians*, who refuse to use several Terms of Divinity; because they are not found in Scripture, and as they alledge, are dark and dubious. It is ordinary for People, when they secretly dislike a Doctrine, to shun the ordinary Terms in which it is expressed 3*dly*. I wish he had told us the meaning of the Sense, in which all Orthodox Divines maintain a formal Imputation of Christ's Righteousness; and then we should have known where to find him: But this he was not pleased to do. 4*thly*. Whether all Orthodox Divines explain the Imputation of

Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, by aſſerting a formal Imputation thereof, I do not determine: But ſure they do it in Terms equivalent, as do alſo the Scriptures, while Chriſt is called, *The LORD our Righteouſneſs*, and we are ſaid, *to have Righteouſneſs in him*; and while he is ſaid *to be made of GOD Righteouſneſs to us*, and ſince this is a moſt clear and emphatick Expreſſion of the thing, I do not underſtand why he ſhould ſhun it. 5*thly*. His ſaying, That the *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſms* have not that Expreſſion, is much like the Shift he uſes, for his not calling the Covenant of Works a proper Covenant, becauſe it is not ſo called in the *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſms*: For neither is the Covenant of Grace called a proper Covenant, either in the Scripture or Confeſſion; yea, nor is any Covenant, between Man and Man, in Scripture called a proper Covenant. 6*ly*. *Marckius* and *Turrettin* ſo explain the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs as any Body may ſee they own a formal Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, that is, That the Righteouſneſs it ſelf is legally reckoned ours, as if we had wrought it (tho' it be not perſonally ours) by Vertue of our Union with Chriſt upon believing. 7*thly*. He ſays, *That if the meaning be, that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs it ſelf is really and truly imputed, and is the Conſideration upon, and for which we obtain Pardon of Sin*: Now, he either takes thir two Branches as identifick, and exegetick one of another; and if ſo, then according to him, the Senſe of a formal Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is only, that his Righteouſneſs is the Conſideration, upon which we are pardoned and accepted with GOD, which I conceive

ceive to be a real denying of this Imputation. For, 1*st*. The Imputation of the Righteousness it self, and its being the Consideration upon which we are pardoned, are different Things; and the second the Effect of the first. 2*dly*. Christ's Righteousness being the Consideration, upon which we are pardoned, doth not make his Righteousness ours, as is obvious; but by the Scripture Imputation, Christ's Righteousness it self becomes really ours, as if we had personally wrought it. 3*dly*. This is no more Imputation, than when a King pardons a Rebel, upon the Account of some signal Service done to him by some Friend of the Rebel's, who is also a Favourite of the King. 4*thly*. This is no more than what *Arminians* grant, *That Christ's Death is the Procuring Cause, and Consideration upon which GOD pardoneth Sinners*: Yea, *Papists* own, *Christ's Death to be the meritorious Cause of our Pardon and Justification; because by his Death he procures that Favour from GOD, that he pardons Sinners for their Repentance:* And yet both of them strenuously oppose an imputed Righteousness.

Or, he takes both these Branches, as distinct Parts included in the Nature of the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness: But this cannot be; because Christ's Righteousness being the Consideration, upon which we are pardoned, is not included in the Nature of Imputation; but is the Effect of it, and may be where there is no Imputation at all, as we shewed in the Instance of the pardoned Rebel. 8*thly*. I wish he had explained the Term *Imputation*, in what Sense he owns the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, *viz.* if he allow Christ's Righteousness to be really ours, that

is, in a Law Sense to be reckoned and accepted as ours (as if we had really wrought it) by Vertue of Christ's Representing Believers in his Obeying and Suffering, and their Union with him upon their believing in him as their Head. If he did own an Imputation in this Sense, I suppose he would not have bogled so much at the Expression (of a formal Imputation) and there is Reason for this, seing he not only grants, That he uses not the Expression *formal Imputation*; but also that he uses not the Expression *Righteousness it self*; and I suppose, that this last Expression is used by several Divines. *9thly.* He says, *That the Use of these Terms,* formal Imputation, *and* Righteousness it self, *in the Way he explains Imputation, is needless.* Now I wish he had more clearly told us his Way of explaining *Imputation:* For it seems by his own Confession, that he explains Imputation in a Way peculiar to himself, and keeps not the ordinary Road. *10ly.* According to his Opinion, Imputation, either of Sin or Righteousness by a Divine Act, admits of no Distinction; and so if Christ's Righteousness it self be not imputed, it is not imputed at all. This seems a little strange; for do not Divines commonly distinguish Imputation of Sin (as well as they do the Sense, in which one may be said to die for another, which in Scripture is various, for as Christ dies for his People, so Believers are to lay down their Lives for the Brethren) into *Imputatio Culpæ et Pœnæ:* It is true the last is not a proper Imputation, yet such Distinctions serve to explain the Thing. *2dly.* It is true, Imputation of Christ's Righteousness in Scripture Sense, admits

mits of no Distinction: Yet, 1*st*. He cannot but know that some that deny a proper formal Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, yet own a more general and mediate Imputation, which is plain from his condemning the Imputation of that Righteousness, as to the Effects. 2*dly*. There is even in Scripture a Foundation for imputing the Obedience of one to another in general, in more Senses than one; for we read, *That GOD promised to bless* Isaac, *because* Abraham *obeyed his Voice*; and that *because* David *did that which was right in the Sight of the LORD, therefore his Posterity enjoyed the Throne of* Judah; and so *Jehu*'s Posterity. Now this is a Kind of Imputation, tho' in a more general and lax Sense; yea, according to Mr. *Simson*, it is a proper Imputation; for he describes the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, to be the Consideration upon which we obtain Pardon; and so was *David*'s Integrity one Consideration, for which his Posterity (tho' some of them were wicked) were continued on the Throne of *Judah*; and therefore, according to Mr. *Simson*, *David*'s Obedience was as formally imputed to his Posterity, as Christ's Righteousness is to us. 3*dly*. I wonder how he can say, the Imputation, whether of Sin or of Righteousness, admits no Distinction: He hath doubtless read *Owen* on Justification, where *Pag*: 233, 234, 235 and 236, *&c*. He distinguisheth Imputation, into an *Imputation of that which is our own*, and into an *Imputation of that which is not our own*; and the last Sort he distinguishes into four Branches: But for Brevity's sake I refer the Reader to the Book it self.

10. HE says, *Pag*: 272. *That he is of the same*

Mind

Mind as to the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, as he declared above, about the Imputation of Sin. Here we may gather his Mind: For I think I made it appear very plainly, That he denies the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin, tho' he own the Word. So in a Correspondence with his Doctrine about the Imputation of Sin; he must first deny Christ to have been a federal Head in obeying for elect Sinners, as he denied *Adam* to have been a federal Head. 2*dly*. He must found the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, upon the Promise of a Reward made in Contemplation of his Obedience, and the Extent of the Promise to the Elect: For otherwise, if he found it upon Christ's being a federal Head, he is not of the same Mind as to the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, that he is of as to the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin; which last he founds upon the Extent of the Threatning: And therefore, if he be of the same Mind as to the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, he must found it upon the Extent of the Promise; whereas all Orthodox Divines found the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, upon his federal Representation. 3*dly*. He must make the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, to be an adjudging a Believer to eternal Life by Vertue of the Promise of Life, to be bestowed on the Elect; because of Christ's Obedience; even as he describes the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin to his Posterity, to be an adjudging of them as liable to Death, by Vertue of the Threatning denounced against *Adam*, which extended to his Posterity also.

FROM all which (being his own Doctrine) it

it appears, 1*st*. That the Imputation of Righteousness according to him, is only an adjudging us to Life, by Vertue of the Promise made to the Mediator in Contemplation of his Satisfaction. 2*dly*. Consequently, it's plain, That he understands not the Imputation of Righteousness in the ordinary Sense, for an imputing the very Righteousness it self; but for an adjudging to the Benefits flowing therefrom, upon the Consideration of, and for that Righteousness. 3*dly*. It's plain, That by Imputation in general, he understands nothing but a being legally adjudged to the Benefit or Punishment flowing from another's Obedience or Sin, by Vertue of a Promise and Threatning respectively. So that, 4*thly*. The Obedience of a Subject is as formally imputed to his Son, as Christ's Righteousness is to Believers, when a Promise is made by the King, not only to the Subject, but his Son: For he founds the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin upon the Extent of the Threatning: And says, *That Sins of Parents in the second Command are as formally imputed to their Children, as* Adam's *Sin was to his Posterity: So that by Vertue of the correspondent Promise in that same second Command, the Obedience of good Parents must be as properly imputed to their Posterity as Christ's Righteousness is to the Elect.* From all which, one would think it tolerably plain, That he really denies the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness, however he retain the Expressions, in which I am confirmed by what I heard him declare in the Face of the Assembly, *An*: 1716, *viz*. He openly denied there, in express Words, *That we were guilty of eating the forbidden Fruit when* Adam

Adam *did eat.* As alſo what a reverend Miniſter of his own Synod told me, about ſix Years ago, That he ſuſpected Mr. *Simſon* was not ſound as to the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs: And that Miniſter had very good Occaſion to know the Truth of it.

HE ſays, *That the Imputation of Sin, and Righteouſneſs, admits of no Diſtinction.* We took Notice of this before; and I only add two Things. *1ſt.* Do not *Arminians* bring ſeveral Inſtances of the Imputation of one Man's Sin to another, out of Scripture, to diſprove and evite the Orthodox Senſe of the Imputation of *Adam*'s Sin? *2dly.* Doth not *Turrettin* diſtinguiſh Imputation into immediate and mediate Imputation, tho' he tells us that the laſt is not a proper Imputation, but deſigned by the Enemies for a Shift. See *Queſt: 9. Part: 1. De Imputatione Inobedientiæ Adami.* See alſo, § 9. 10. of that Queſtion. And ſo he diſtinguiſheth Imputation, *Part: 2. pag:* 707. *Queſt: 3. De Imputatione Obedientiæ Chriſti,* §. 7.

11. HE alledges, he agrees with Doctor *Owen,* (as to the Senſe of Imputation) upon Juſtification, *Page* 253. But there I can find nothing of the Imputation, I ſuppoſe it muſt be *page* 235. Where indeed he gives ſeveral Diſtinctions of Imputation of both Sin and Righteouſneſs, as we obſerved before, in which Mr. *Simſon* differs from Doctor *Owen*; for he allows no Diſtinction of the Imputation whether of Sin, or Righteouſneſs. To clear how Mr. *Owen* and Mr. *Simſon* agrees upon this, I ſhall ſet down Mr. *Owen*'s Deſcription of the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs: Says he, *This Imputation is an Act of GOD.*

of

of his meer Love and Grace, whereby on the Consideration of the Mediation of Christ, he makes an effectual Grant and Donation, of a true, real, perfect Righteousness, even that of Christ himself unto all that believe, and accounting it as theirs, on his own gracious Act, doth absolve them from sin, and granteth them a Right and Title unto eternal Life. Where we may notice two Things, *First*, Mr. *Owen* says, *That the Righteousness of Christ himself is gifted to Believers*, which I would think, is the same with the Righteousness it self. 2*dly*. He says, *GOD accounts that Righteousness as theirs*, which seems to be the same with a formal Imputation of the Righteousness it self; neither of which we have heard yet from Mr. *Simson*, nor the particular Sense, in which he owns the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness.

12. As to the second Sense of the Proposition, he declares he can say nothing about it, *&c.* And so neither can I, since Professor *Simson* the Author of this Distinction is not pleased to tell us, if it be the *Antinomian* Error: I wish he had given the second Sense of a formal Imputation, and perhaps we might have found, whether he accounts the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness to us as ours, as if we had personally wrought it our selves, an *Antinomian* Error. For I judge he hath not yet spoke out his Mind plainly. 2*dly*. It no more follows, that Mr. *Webster* accounts *Antinomians* Orthodox, because he hath not named them among the Adversaries to an imputed Righteousness, more than his not naming *Quakers*, and several others, who yet are Adversaries to an imputed Righteousness: And indeed I suppose

poſe, that *Antinomians* err not ſo much upon the Left Hand by denying this Imputation, as upon the Right, by aſſerting the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs from all Eternity.

13. WHETHER it be falſe, *page* 275. that he diſowns a formal Imputation of Chriſt's active Obedience, *i. e.* as he himſelf calls it, a true and real Imputation (for it ſeems there is ſomething he loves not in the Expreſſion, therefore he will not call it a formal Imputation without an Explication, I wiſh it were known what he diſlikes. Any Perſon may judge from what has been remarked, for its not bare Words, but the Senſe of them about which we debate.

AS to his Anſwer to the ſecond Branch of the Charge, he grants plainly, that ſome of our Divines writing on this Head, have uſed dangerous Terms, bordering upon *Antinomianiſm*, &c. Now, *Firſt*, This is a bold Cenſure, for it ſeems ſeverals of our Divines are guilty of not uſing a form of ſound Words. But, *2dly*. All the Inſtances he can give, is only of ſome who aſſert the Covenant of Grace to be abſolute; but he ſhould have named ſome who border upon *Antinomianiſm*, as to the Imputation of Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, and who uſe dangerous Expreſſions, and pointed at the Book and Place, and then we might have found out Mr. *Simſon*'s Mind more clearly; but this he thought fit to paſs. *3dly*. As to theſe who aſſert the Covenant of Grace to be abſolute, (and I ſuppoſe they are very few, except ſome *Diſſenters* in *England*) he may know that they do not deny, but that believing is required as a previous Duty before we can be juſtified or pardoned

doned, and ſo differ from *Antinomians*, who are ſaid to maintain the Elects Juſtification from Eternity; or, at leaſt, from the Death of Chriſt. 4*thly*. They allowing Faith to preceed Juſtification, do ſeem only to deny Faith to be a legal Condition upon which our Juſtification is founded, not a connectional Condition, and of meer order: Only it ſeems they think, a Condition of Juſtification upon our Part, ſeems to look towards a Covenant of Works; yet they allow Faith to be the Inſtrument whereby Chriſt's Righteouſneſs is applied. 5*thly*. I wonder how he can condemn them who maintain the Abſoluteneſs of the Covenant, for in treating of the Covenant of Works, he owns himſelf one of them who maintain that Doctrine, ſee *page* 168 of his Anſwers towards the foot. 6*thly*. Even they who deny the the Covenant of Grace to have any Precepts (tho' for my own Part I differ from them, and think they are wrong) do not deny Believers to be under the Precepts of the Law; only they ſay, the Covenant of Grace as ſuch, is made up only of Promiſes, and that the Obligation to the Moral Law as a Rule, ſtill remains upon them, but does not properly belong to the Covenant of Grace as ſuch: Now, even in this they differ from *Antinomians* (if I miſtake not their Tenets, becauſe I have had occaſion to read very little about them) who deny all Preceptive Obligation, and own only an Obligation of Love and Gratitude. 7*thly*. For my Part, as I am againſt Right Hand Extreams, ſo alſo I am againſt Left Hand ones, upon which I judge Profeſſor *Simſon* borders, when he makes Holineſs not only a Mean, but alſo

alſo a Condition of Salvation, tho' not of Juſtification: For, 1*ſt*. He above made Obedience to the Commands a neceſſary Prerequiſite to Juſtification, and I ſee not how this differs from a Condition, as we ſhewed formerly. 2*dly*, I thought that the actual Poſſeſſion of Salvation, and Right to it, were bottomed upon the ſame *Baſis*, *viz*. Chriſt's imputed Righteouſneſs; but it ſeems according to him our actual poſſeſſing Salvation is bottomed upon our Perſeverance and Holineſs. 3*dly*. I would know, in what Senſe he underſtands Condition, when he makes Holineſs the Condition of the Poſſeſſion of Salvation; if he confound it with the Means of poſſeſſing Salvation, then it is infallibly true: But his Oppoſing Holineſs as a Condition of Salvation, to Faith as a Condition of Juſtification, ſhews that he means, that Holineſs is a Condition in Reference to the firſt, as Faith is a Condition with reference to the laſt: And ſo I would know, whether it be a Condition relatively with reference to its Object, as Faith is, but this cannot be, becauſe Holineſs hath not an imputed Righteouſneſs for its Object, but the whole Law. Or, 2*dly*. If it be a condition abſolutely, and as conſidered in it ſelf, then Holineſs is a more proper Condition of actual Salvation, than Faith is of a Right to it; for Faith is only a Condition, as it lays hold on an imputed Righteouſneſs, which thereby becomes the Man's, and ſo founds his Title to Salvation; but Holineſs will be a Condition of Salvation conſidered in it ſelf, whereby our actual Poſſeſſion of Salvation will be bottom'd upon our Holineſs as our Right to it is founded upon Chriſt's

Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, laid hold on by Faith, and ſo Holineſs will be the Condition of the Poſſeſſion of Salvation in the ſame Senſe, that good Works, by the Covenant of Works, would have been of our actual obtaining of Life, tho' not ſo perfect a Condition, yet of the ſame Kind; here again we ſee a ſecond Juſtification by Works.

IN the laſt place, as to what he remarks as to Mr. *Webſter*'s ſpeaking of the Church's Danger by his Tenets, I think it not worth while to inſiſt upon, being a falſe, wicked and ſcandalous Comparing Miniſters and others, who would have his Errors cenſured, to *Jacobite* High-flyers of the Church of *England*, any Body who reads what a *Farrago* of Errors he Maintains in his Defences, and withal conſiders the Chair he ſits in, may eaſily judge of this Church's Danger, of which, if GOD in his Mercy prevent it not, we may come to feel the bitter Effects when they cannot be ſo well remedied; and therefore whether he teaches the Doctrine of our *Confeſſion of Faith*, defending it againſt Adverſaries, refuting their Errors, *&c.* we refer to the Judgment of the intelligent and impartial Reader, who ſhall pleaſe to conſider the Remarks made by us upon his Anſwers.

CHAP. XVI.

Concerning the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, &c.

AS to the Holy Ghoſt his Proceeding from the Son as well as the Father, he ſeems to be of the Opinion of the *Greek* Church, who ſays, *That the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from the Father by the Son.* As to this I ſhall ſay nothing, only if it agree ſo well with our

our *Confeſſion of Faith, Chap.* 2. §. 3. I much doubt but I paſs it.

2. As to the Magiſtrates Power in things ſacred, I have nothing to Remark, ſince he denies he Aſcribes any more Power to the Magiſtrate than our *Confeſſion* and Acts of *Aſſembly* allow; and therefore ſince he does not more particularly explain himſelf, I paſs this Head alſo.

3. As alſo that about eating of Blood, for though I judge he be in the wrong in denying the lawfulneſs of eating Blood; yet it not being a Point very Material, I inſiſt not upon it. I wiſh he maintained no greater Errors, if ſo I ſhould not be a very ſevere Cenſurer of him.

4. I likewiſe paſs that of his ſaying *Marckius hallucinatur*; I know that the Signification ſometimes is ſofter, and ſignifies only to be Miſtaken: If the things wherein he differs from *Marckius* were not of Moment and Importance, his ſaying *Marckius hallucinatur* might be the more eaſily born with; but we ſee, he differs not only from him, and ſeveral other ſound Divines, but alſo from our *Confeſſion of Faith* and *Catechiſms*, in Points of the greateſt Moment and Conſequence; but I likewiſe paſs this Head.

CHAP. XVII.

Concerning the Moon and other Planets, being inhabited by Rational Creatures.

AS to this Head Profeſſor *Simſon* judges it probable, *That there may be Rational Creatures Inhabiting the Moon and other Planets.*

2dly.

adly. He asserts, *That there is in this Opinion neither Danger nor Contrarieties to Scripture, more than in holding that the Earth is round, and that there are* Antipodes, *both which were sometime a Day thought contrary to Scripture.* *3dly.* He *thinks it not improper for a Professor of Divinity's Chair, seing other Professors thought it proper both for their Chair and Pen to oppose it, and therefore he thought it as proper for him to treat of it.* *4thly.* He *thinks it his his Duty to let his Scholars know that there is nothing in Scripture that is inconsistent with the true Principles of Natural Philosophy, which they are taught at this and other Universities in this Kingdom, in a far greater Degree of Perfection than in* Holland, *and that by whatever he hath observed of its Progress, the more we advance in the true Knowledge of Nature, our Philosophy agrees better with the true Sense of Scripture, and is more serviceable to the true Christian Theology, and the more confounding to its Adversaries, as this Speculation also is, wherefore, he thinks, he serves the true Interest of Religion, when he uses his best Endeavours to remove Prejudices and Stumbling blocks.*

UPON this I offer these Considerations in general. And, *1st.* I humbly conceive that some learned Men have been a little too bold in determining that Point, as if indeed they had travelled to that World of the Moon and other Planets, *2dly.* Indeed many things may be known concerning the Moon and other Planets, as to the uses for which in Scripture we read they were created, as they are Signs and Measures of Time, for Man's Life and Comfort, and for the Production of things on Earth,

Earth, but as for other Speculations, they are oft-times vain and idle, becauſe the Diſtance of them from us is ſo great, that we want Mediums whereby we may know whether they be like this Earth or not, and far more whether they be inhabited. *3dly.* The Reaſons generally advanced by Men who are fond of theſe Speculations, not only tend to prove it is probable, but that it is certain, that the Moon and Planets are inhabited by Rational Creatures. *4thly.* All the Reaſons advanced for this idle Speculation, that puffs up Men with vain Pride, and tends to take them off the Scriptures, are grounded upon their Philoſophical Speculations, which, if they be well grounded, may juſtly be a Queſtion. They cannot reſolve a great many Queſtions concerning Things nearer at Hand, as concerning the Diviſibility of Matter; and a great many *Phenomenas* in Nature, and yet they will dogmatically determine this Queſtion concerning the Moon and Planets, that ly at ſuch a vaſt Diſtance from us. *5thly* Some Profeſſors of Divinity are obliged to handle that Queſtion in order to refute it, becauſe ſome others needleſly bring that in to aſſert and maintain it, which Side Mr. *Simſon* chuſes. Indeed if this Queſtion were treated only within the Walls of a Philoſophy Claſs, then the handling of ſuch a Speculation were more tolerable; But I conceive that a Profeſſor of Divinity ſhould keep by the Scriptures, as the Rule of what he teaches his Scholars, and not intermingle ſuch idle Speculations with the Doctrines of Faith. *6thly.* It ſeems then that Natural Reaſon is the *Ultimum Principium* and *Fundamentum Religionis* and above the Scriptures. For he ſays,

That

That it's his Work to teach his Scholars that there is nothing in Scripture, that is inconsistent with the true Principles of Natural Philosophy, whereby he seems to subordinate the Scriptures to Philosophy, which is of a piece with what he above maintained. *7thly.* Whether Philosophy be taught in our Universities to a greater Perfection than in *Holland*, is what I know not, I am glad if it be so. Yet, *1st.* I do not think it fair to reflect upon our Neighbours. *2dly.* The teaching of this Speculation is not peculiar to our Universities. *3dly.* If teaching this idle Speculation be an Evidence of this, I look upon it as no very great one; and yet worse, if the Divinity taught in our Universities be of a piece with such an idle Speculation. *Lastly.* What Adversaries this Speculation confounds, I know not, and yet far less if it be but ill grounded; neither know I what stumbling Blocks are removed out of the Way thereby; only I observe, That he seems to lay the main Stress of confounding Adversaries, on such Speculations, and upon his Philosophy, which was not the way the Apostles and first Preachers took to convince and convert a *Pagan* World, they knew no other Mean, but the Scriptures and plain preaching of the Gospel; it seems they were at a great loss in the confounding of Adversaries, that they were not acquaint with this and such like Philosophical Speculations; and therefore any indifferent Person may judge, whether such Speculations truly serve the interest of Religion. I wish bringing in such Speculations may not lead Men from the Scriptures, and insensibly betray them, to set their corrupt and short sighted Reason on a level with the Word of GOD.

But to ſhew that this Point is of ſome Weight and Moment, I ſhall ſubjoin the Subſtance of ſome Reaſons advanced by *Witſius* upon the *Creed*, becauſe the Book is in Latine. And, *1ſt.* He pertinently obſerves, That this Fancy ſeems to have been taken from *Lucian* the Atheiſt's Commentaries, in his firſt Book of his true Hiſtories. See *Witſius* on the *Creed*, *Pag.* 134. *2dly.* He argues firſt from *Gen.* 1. 26. *Let us make Man after our Image, &c.* where the making of Man is brought in as the Concluſion, and moſt excellent Work of the viſible Creation. Does not this imply, *1ſt.* That then there was no Man (*i. e.* a Rational Creature made up of Spirit and Body) created in the Univerſe. *2dly.* It ſays that Men were created no where but on this Earth, for the Phraſe reſtrains it to this Earth, otherways the *Emphaſis* is loſt, if we ſuppoſe there were Men at that Time in the Moon and other Planets. *2dly.* He argues from *Iſaiah* 45. 18. Where it is ſaid, *He created not the Earth in vain, but to be inhabited*, which plainly ſhews that Men inhabit no where but upon this Earth. *3dly.* He argues from *Acts* 17. 26. Where it's ſaid, *That he made of one Blood, all Nations of Men to dwell upon the Face of the Earth.* But if this Speculation be true, then there are more Nations of Men dwelling, than are upon the Face of the Earth. *4thly.* He goes upon Reaſon, if in the Moon and other Planets there be Men, they have continued either in their Primitive Integrity, or have fallen: Now it is a Wonder, that Mention of none of them is made in Scripture, ſeing ſo many occaſions thereof did offer themſelves in the Word. For either, *1ſt.* The Inhabitants

bitants of these Planets did keep their Integrity; if so, this served to aggravate our Sin in falling; And also to shew the Largeness of that blessed Assembly in Heaven, and the Sweetness of Fellowship therewith; where there is an Assembly made up, not only of Saints here, but of innumerable Myriads of Saints from the Moon and other Planets, especially since we find, that General Assembly commended from the sweet Society of Angels there, to whom we stand not under such a near Relation as we would do in Reference to these Inhabitants, were there any such. 2*dly*. If they have fallen as we have: Then, 1*st*. Either they are left for ever under their Misery: Or, 2*dly*. Some of them are redeemed by Christ, as we are: Or, 3*dly*. They are saved some other Way than we. Not the first, Because, besides that it cannot be known, it would seem, that such Worlds of Men had been created in vain, if GOD's Grace was to be manifested in the Salvation of none of them: Further, it had been a great Argument to commend GOD's love to *Adam*'s Family, that he had passed by not only the Inhabitants of the Moon and other Planets, but also of the numberless Planets that move about the Stars, seing we find GOD commending his Love to us in passing by fallen Angels, *Heb.* 2. 14. to whom we do not stand in such a near Relation: Not the second, Because Christ took not on him a Nature out of their Family, as he has done out of ours, nor taught, nor suffered, nor shewed himself glorious among them, neither have we any Ground to think, that ever the Gospel was preached to them: Nor can the third be

ſaid, for there is no other Way of Salvation but by Chriſt. *Act.* 4. 12.

WE ſhall yet ſubjoin ſome other Reaſons to ſhew, That this is a Point of ſome Weight. As *1ſt.* We can only know for what Uſes and Ends the Moon, Stars, and Planets were created from the Word of GOD. Now the Scripture tells us, That they were created for Man's Uſe, and the Service of the Earth; as to divide Day from Night, to be for Signs and for Seaſons, to Influence the Fruitfulneſs of the Earth, that they may be a great Glaſs in which Man might contemplate the Power, Wiſdom, and Goodneſs of his Creator. See *Gen:* 1. 14, 15. *Deut:* 4. 19. *Pſ:* 136. 7. *Pſ:* 19. 1. *Pſ:* 8. 3. It is a Wonder, if the Moon, and other Planets were to be inhabited by Men, that there is never a Word of this in the Scriptures. It's ſtrange, That Men by their philoſophical Speculations ſhould be able to diſcover a more material End in creating the Moon and Planets, than is revealed to us in the Scriptures: And doth not that Scripture *Deut:* 4. 19. already cited, where the Moon and Stars are ſaid to be divided to all Nations under Heaven, thereby inform us, That their great Deſign was the ſerving of Man: So that it is idle to think they are inhabited by another Family of Men. *2dly.* It ſeems plain from *Eph:* 1. 10. See alſo *Col:* 1. 20. where it's ſaid that the End of Chriſt's Death was, That all Things whether in Heaven or Earth, might be gathered together in him as their Head. Where notice *1ſt.* That there is only Mention made of Angels, the Inhabitants of Heaven and of Men, the Inhabitants of

of Earth; ſo, there is not a third Sort of Inhabitants: To expound Heaven, or Heavens of the Planets, is ſo groſs, that I need not inſiſt upon it; and plainly contrar to all Commentators on the Place: This is alſo further confirm'd from *Dan*: 4. 35. where GOD is ſaid to do his Will in the Armies of Heaven, and among the Inhabitants of the Earth. We ſee, That there are only two Sorts of rational Creatures, to whom GOD's Dominion extends: And therefore, to dream of a third Sort, is to intrude into Things Men have not ſeen. 2*dly*. We would notice, That all theſe Things whether in Heaven or Earth, are ſaid to be gathered in one, to wit, in Chriſt as their Head: So that if there be Inhabitants of the Moon and other Planets, they, or at leaſt ſome of them, muſt alſo be gathered into Chriſt as their Head. And if ſo, then 1*ſt*. It is in him as their Head, either by Way of Redemption, or by Way of Confirmation; as ſome ſay he is the Head of elect Angels: One of them ineviteably follows, and whether of them be aſſerted, it's a ſpeaking without Scripture in a Matter of ſuch Moment: Beſides, the Difficulties advanced by *Witſius*, recur upon this Head. 2*dly*. If they be gathered in Chriſt as their Head, they muſt have ſome Knowledge and Revelation of Chriſt as a Head? But will any affirm, that ever the Goſpel was ſent or preached to theſe Inhabitants of the Moon. 3*dly*. Another Scripture we advance is, *Eph*: 3. 15. where the whole Families of the Heaven and Earth, are ſaid to be named of the Lord Jeſus; where it's plain, That there are but

two

two Families of them that are ſaved, making up one Family, *viz.* one of the glorified in Heaven, and the other of the Saints on Earth: So that there are either none of the Inhabitants of theſe Planets among that Family that is named of Jeſus; which plainly reflects upon the Mediator's Glory: Or elſe *Paul* makes not a ſufficient Enumeration of theſe that are named of Jeſus: Or if we reduce them to the Family in Heaven, I think it new and unheard of, and contrary to the Contexture of the Words, and is to join them with the Family of Angels, and glorified Saints which are in a confirmed State. *4thly.* This is further clear from *Heb.* 12. 22. where we find, as making up that General Aſſembly of the Church, The Angels, and Spirits of juſt Men made perfect; ſo that it ſeems none of the Inhabitants of theſe Planets belong to that Aſſembly. For, there is no Hint about them. *5thly.* It's plain alſo from *Rev.* 5. 8, 9. where the Church in Heaven is repreſented as gathered out of all Nations, and redeemed by Chriſt's Blood; and upon that Account, celebrating the Praiſes of the Redeemer. Now if there be Inhabitants of the Planets, they either will not be among that Company of all Nations that would be praiſing Chriſt for Redemption by his Blood: Or Chriſt hath ſhed his Blood alſo, for the Inhabitants of theſe new Worlds: Both which are very ſtrange.

NEXT, the Moon, Sun, and Stars, and all the viſible Heavens, are to be deſtroyed with Fire at the laſt Day for Man's Sin; as is plain from Scripture. Now if there be Inhabitants in the Planets, is it not ſtrange, that their Habitations

ſhould

ſhould be thus deſtroyed for our Sins, that live ſo remote from them? Certainly they being to be deſtroyed for Man's Sin, as well as the Earth, ſays, they were made only for Man's Service, and not for Inhabitants of their own. Would it not ſeem ſtrange if Man had ſtood here, that this Earth ſhould have been deſtroyed, for the Sins of the Inhabitants of theſe Planets upon Suppoſition they had fallen as Man hath. It's true, thô' Man had ſtood, the Earth would not have been ay his Habitation; yet we have no Reaſon to think it would have been deſtroyed by Fire, what ever Ends the Lord might have been pleaſed to reſerve it for.

LASTLY, This Opinion multiplies Worlds of Men into infinite Numbers, may be ſix or ſeven times more than there are fixed Stars; for our Philoſophers tell us, That the Stars are like the Sun, and many of them at leaſt far greater; and that they may have their reſpective Planets moving about them, as the Sun has; ſo that the ſame *Hypotheſis*, that proves there are or may be Worlds of Men in the Moon and Planets, will alſo prove the ſame, as to the Planets, that move about the Stars: And there being Millions of Stars, the Planets according to this Suppoſition, that move about the Stars may be rationally ſuppoſed to be ſix or ſeven times more than the Stars themſelves; and ſo according to Mr. *Simſon*'s Philoſophy there will be ſix or ſeven times more Worlds, than there are fixed Stars in the Heavens. If this *Philoſophy* do not lead Men, *to be wiſe above what is written*, let any indifferent Perſon judge.

THERE is one Thing I forgot to take Notice of

of, *viz. That this Opinion is no more dangerous, than holding there are* Antipodes, *which ſometime a Day was thought ſtrange and dangerous:* But any may ſee the Diſparity; for the *Antipodes* and we dwell on the ſame *Terraqueous Globe*, and there is Communication with them by Ships; whereas betwixt us and the Moon, and other Planets there are a vaſt many Thouſands of Miles of liquid Air, whereby we can have no Communications with theſe Places, to know whether there be Inhabitants there or not: Nor are all the Inſtruments of Philoſophers able to give them this Knowledge.

LASTLY, to ſhut up our Remarks on his Defences, he confeſſes, *Pag*: 287 of his Anſwers, *That ſeveral Brethren may differ from him about the Truth, and Uſefulneſs of ſome of his Opinions*; but ſays, *The Difference can be of no ill Conſequence to the Church: if the Apoſtle's Rule*, Phil: 3. *of forbearing one another, and walking by the ſame Rule, be obſerved.* But 1ſt. It is ordinary for People, that would have Liberty to vent their Errors, either to pretend, they are but Things of leſſer Moment, or to plead for a Liberty of *Propheſying.* 2*dly.* The Angels of the Churches are reproved, for ſuffering the teaching of Error, *Rev.* 2 and 3 *Chapters*, among which was the *eating of Things ſacrificed to Idols*, which one would have thought, tho' an Error, yet not of the greateſt Moment; for *Paul* in ſome Caſes allowed the *Corinthians* to make *no Queſtions for Conſcience ſake*, 1 *Cor*: 10. where he is ſpeaking of Meats offered to Idols. 3*dly.* Leſſer Errors overlooked do produce greater, and in Iſſue prove like the Muſtard Seed, when grown up: The Tares oftimes are not obſerved

ved, till they be past weeding. 4*thly*. A Truce between Truth and Error, has ever been fatal to to Truth, like the Marriages of the *Israelites* with the *Amorites*. 5*thly*. Whether his Scheme be only a Method, somewhat different of defending the same Doctrines, as he pretends, or really a betraying, and giving up a great many of our Doctrines, under a Pretence of defending others of them the better, against Adversaries of the Truth; as also, whether the Errors taken Notice of be small, and only in Things of lesser Moment; or whether they do not rather touch the very Vitals of Religion, any indifferent Person of Judgement, and who is acquaint with the Doctrine of this Church may from the Considerations we have advanced upon his Answers easily determine.

FINIS.

INDEX.

INDEX.

John Fleming of Book... 1730

This Book contains many excellent things. but an attentive reader would wish it were freed from many Scholastic terms and the arguments drawn from Scripture rather than from the opinion of orthodox divines all churches have Err and may err, but the word of God is an infallible rule ---

The Book is undoubtedly a most decisive answer to Simpson upon his own principles and therefore better calculated for confuting him than for instructing others a Reader ---